

AN ANSWER
TO A BOOKE ENTITLED,
AN HVMBLE
REMONSTRANCE.

In which,
LITURGY
The Originall of
EPISCOPACY
is discusſed.

And Quæres propounded concerning both.

The PARITY of Bishops and Presbyters in Scrip-
ture Demonstrated.

The occasion of their IMPARITY in Antiquity
discovered.

The DISPARITY of the Ancient and our Moderne
Bishops manifested.

The ANTIQUITY of Ruling Elders in the Church
vindicated.

The PRELATICAL Church Bownded.

JEREMY 6. 16.

*Thus saith the Lord, stand in the wayes, and Behold, and aske for
the Old Way, which is the Way, and walke therein.*

Tertul. de præscr. adv. hæres.

*Id Dominicum & verum, quod prius traditum: id autem extraneum
& falsum quod sit posterius.*

Written by S M E C T Y M N V V S.

*Rep. Marshall Ed. Calamy. J. Young. M. Newcomen
LONDON, W. Spurgis*

Printed for I. Rothwell, and are to be sold by T. N. at the
Bible in Popes-Head-Alley. 1641.

MOST
HONOURABLE
LORDS,

AND YE THE KNIGHTS,
CITIZENS, AND BURGES-
SES, of the Honourable House of
COMMONS.

Although we doubt not, but that book which was lately directed to your Honours, bearing the name of an *Humble Remonstrance*, hath had access unto your presence: and is in the first approaches of it, discovered by your discerning spirits, to be neither *Humble*, nor a *Remonstrance*; but a heape of confident, and ungrounded assertions; so that to your Honours a Reply may seeme superfluous: Yet lest the Authour should glory in our silence, as a granting of the cause; we humbly crave your Honours leave, to present, not so much to your selves, as to the world by your hands, a review of this Remonstrance; in which the Authour after too large a *Preface*, undertakes the support of two things; which seeme to him to bee threatened with danger of a present precipice, *the Liturgy*, and *the Hierarchie*.

It was a constitution of those admired sonnes of Iustice the *Areopagi*; that such as pleaded before them should pleade without *prefacing* and without *Passion*: had your Honours made such a constitution, this Remonstrance must have beene banished from the face of your Assembly: for

the *Preface* fills almost a fourth part of the Booke, and the rest swells with so many *passionate Rhetorickations*, as it is harder for us in the multitude of his words to finde what his argument is, that we have to answer, then to answer it when it is found.

Pag. 23.

We would not trace him in his words, but close immediately with his arguments; did wee not finde in him a sad exemplification of that Divine Axiome, in *Multitudine verborum non deest peccatum*, in the multitude of words there wants no sinne: for though the Authour is bold to call upon your *Honours* to heare the words of truth and confidence, yet how little truth there is in this great confidence, the ensuing discourse shall discover.

His very first words are confident enough, and yet as false as confident; wherein he *Impropriates* all honesty unto these his Papers, and brands all others with the name of *Libellers*, and yet himselfe sins deeply against the rule of honesty, and lies naked to the scourge of his owne censure.

I.
Pag. 1.

First, in setting a brand upon all writings that have lately issued from the presse, as if they had all forgotten to speake any other language then *Libellous*: it seemes himselfe had forgotten, that some things had issued by Authority of the King and Parliament.

2
3
Pag. 2.

Secondly, in taxing (implicitly) all such as will not ownethis Remonstrance for theirs: as, none of the peaceable and well-affected Sons of the Church of England.

Thirdly, in censuring the way of petitioning your Honours, the Ancient and ordinary free way of seeking redresse of our evils, for a *Tumultuary under-band way*.

4.
Pag. 3.

Fourthly, in condemning all such as are not fautors of this *Episcopall Cause*, as none of his Majesties good Subjects, engrossing that praise onely to his owne party, saying, *The eyes of us the good Subjects of this whole Realme are fixed upon your Successse, &c.*

5.
Pag. 6.

Fiftly, in *Impropriating* to the same party the praise of *Orthodox*, pag. 6. as if to speak a word, or think a thought against.

against Episcopacy, were no lesse Heresie, then it was in former time to speake against the Popes supremacy, or the monkes fat Belly; whereas whether the *Episcopall* part be the *Orthodox, peaceable, well affected part, and his Majesties onely good Subjects*, wee leave to your Honours to Iudge, upon the numerous Informations that flow in unto you from the severall parts of this Kingdome.

Nor can they decline your Iudgment, *seeing now you are* Pag. 2.
(*through Gods blessing*) happily met in a much longed for Parliament: but whether so much longed for by him and his accomplices; as by those against whom he whets his Style, the Prayers that have obtained this happy meeting, and the prayles that doe attend it, will decide in that great day.

The *Helena*, whose Champion this Remonstrant chiefly is: is that *Government* which hee calles *Sacred*, viz. that *Governement by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deanes, Archdeacons, &c.* which, saith he, through the sides of *some misliked persons* some have endeavoured to wound. *Misliked Persons?* and why not offending persons? why not guilty persons? when this *Honourable house* hath found just cause to charge some of them, with crimes of the highest nature. Our zeale for your *Honours* make us feare, lest your assembly shold suffer in this word; as if your proceedings against such persons shoud be groundd upon compliance with such as doe mislike them, rather then upon their owne demerits, or the Iustice of this Court.

But what ever those Persons be, the Government it self. Pag. 7.
is Sacred; which by the joynt confession of all reformed Divines, derives it selfe from the times of the blessed Apostles, Untruths.
without any interruption, without contradiction of any one congregation in the world unto this present age. This is but an *Episcopall Bravado*, therefore we let it passe, till we come to close and contend with him in the point; where we shall demonstrate, that in the compasse of three lines hee hath packt up as many untruths, as could be smoothly couched in so few words, as any man of common understanding, that lookes upon the face of the Government

of almost all reformed Churches in the Christian world, may at first view discover.

*Remon.
pag 8.*

But before we come to this, there are yet two things in this Preface which we count not unworthy observation. The *First* is, the comparison which he makes between the two Governments, the Civill which with us is *Monarchie*: and the sacred which with him is *Episcopacy*. Of the first he saith, if *Antiquity may be the Rule*; (as he pleades it for Episcopacy) or if Scripture (as he interprets Scripture) it is VARIABLE, and ARBITRARY: but the other DIVINE and VNALTERABLE, so that had men petitioned for the altering of *Monarchicall* Government, they had (in his Iudgement) beene lesse culpable, both by Scripture, and Antiquity, then in petitioning the alteration of the *Hierarchicall*: Had he found but any such passage in any of his *Lewd Libellers* (as his modesty is alwayes pleased to tearme them) certainly if we may borrow his owne phrase, the cares of the *three Interestted Kingdomes*, yea, all the neighbour Churches, and if we may say, the whole Christian world, and no small part beyond it, had rung with the lowd cries of no lesse then *Treason, Treason*.

Malmesbury lib. 4.

Hist. Concil. Trid.

Truth is, in his *Antiquity* we find that *this his uninterrupted sacred Government*, hath so far invaded the Civill, and so yoked Monarchy, even in this Kingdome, as *Malmesbury* reports: That *William Rufus* oppressed by Bishops, perswaded the Iewes to confute them; promising thereupon to turne *England* to their Religion, that he might be free of Bishops. And this is so naturall an effect of *unalterable Episcopacy*, that *Pius* the fourth to the *Spanish* Embassadour, importuning him to permit Bishops to be declared by the Councell of *Trent*, to be *Iure Divino*, gave this answer: That his King knew not what he did desire, for if Bishops should be so declared, they would be all exempted from his Power, and as indepedent as the Pope himselfe.

The second thing observable is the comparison hee makes betweene the late *Alterations* attempted in our Neighbour Church by his Episcopall faction, and that *Altera-*

Alteration that is now justly desired by the humble petitioners to this Honourable House. The one being attempted by strangers, endeavouring violently to obtrude Innovations upon a settled Church and State, The other humbly petitioned to the Heads and Princes of our State by Multitudes therein almost ruined by an Innovating Faction: yet doth not this Remonstrant blush to say; if these be branded, (so he calls the just censures of this Honorable House) For Incendiaries, how shall these Bonteseux escape, &c. thus cunningly endeavouring either to justify the former by the practise of the latter, or to render the latter more odious then the former.

Pag. 9.

The attempts of these men whom he would thus render odious, hee craves leave to present to your Honours in two things, which are the subjects of this quarrell: The *Liturgie* and *Episcopacy*, and we humbly crave your Honours leave in both to answer.

SECT. II.

First, the *Liturgie* of the Church of England (saith he) hath bin hitherto esteemed sacred, reverently used by holy Martyrs, daily frequented by devout Protestants, as that which more then once hath been confirmed by the Edicts of religious Princes, and your own Parliamentary Acts, &c. And hath it so? whence then proceed these many Additions and Alterations? that have so changed the face and fabrick of the *Liturgie*, that as Dr. Hall spake once of the pride of England: if our fore-fathers should revive and see their daughters walking in *Cheapside* with their fannes and farthingales, &c. they would wonder what kinde of creatures they were, and say Nature had forgot her selfe and brought forth a monster: so if these holy Martyrs that once so reverently used the *Liturgie* should revive and looke for their Letany stampt by Authority of Parliament, they would be amased, and wondering say; England had forgotten her selfe and brought forth, &c. Martyrs? what doe we speake of Martyrs when we know Sir, that one of your owne^a Bishops said

Liturgie.

Pag. 10.

a Ad hoc malorum devoluta est Ecclesia Dei & sponsa Christi ut haereticorum exempla sectentur & ad celebranda sacramenta celestia, disciplina, Lux mutetur de tenebris, & id faciant christiani quod Antichristi faciunt. Cyp. Ep. 74.

it

...the authority of many such things, but you may
well remember, that the Bishop of the Church of Eng-
land was so diligent that if the Pope should come and see it,
he would claim it as his own, but that it is in English.

It is like then to the advantage of your cause, that you
sell us *it* in our own language, and as little ser-
vice have they done to the Church of England, who have
taught our Prayers to speak Latin against. For if it be
their Language chiefly that overthrows the Popes claim,
take away that, and what hinders them, but the Pope may
say, *these are mine*.

As for other Translations and the great applause it hath
obtained from *Foreign Drapers*, which are the fumes this
Remonstrant vendicates; what last dayes have produ-
ced we know not, but the great lights of former ages
have borne fare from this applauding; we are sure judici-
ous Calvinist faith, that in the Liturgy there are sundry
Tolerabiles Ineptia, which we thinke is no very great ap-
plause.

To vindicate this Liturgy from *scams* (as he calles it) at
home, or by your Honours aide to reinforce it upon the Na-
tion, is the work of his Remonstrance; for the effecting
whereof he falls into an *supererogatory* discourse about the
Antiquity of Liturgies, we call it *supererogatory*, because no
man that we have seen ever drew the line of Liturgy so
high as he hath done.

Concerning which, if by Liturgy this Remonstrant
understand an Order observed in Church assemblies of
Praying, reading, and expounding the Scriptures, Admini-
sting Sacraments, &c. Such a Liturgy we know and do ac-
knowledge both *Jews* and *Christians* have used. But if by
Liturgy hee understand prescribed and fixed formes of
Administration Composed by some particular man in the
Church, and imposed upon all the rest (as that he must
understand, or else all his faith is nothing) we desire
and expect that those formes, which he saith are yet extant,
and ready to be produced, might come to light.

Liturgy of this former sort we find in *Isidorus Mar-
tyr* and

and that there were not such fixed Li-
 turgies, as the Church of Rome has, appears by Ter-
 tullian in his *de Idolol.* Chap. 10. where he saith the Christians
 of that age did in their publique assemblies pray *semper
 eundem deum, eundemque Patrem* without any Prompter but their
 own hearts, and that still should be the same Father proved
 in his *de Orat.* *Sunt quæ petantur, &c.* There
 are some things to be asked according to the occasions of e-
 very particular assembly of ordinary prayer (that is the Lords
 Prayer being said as a foundation, it is lawfull to build up-
 on that foundation other prayers according to every ones oc-
 casions). And to the same purpose S. Austin in his 121. Ep.
Testimon. c. 5. it is law to aske the same things that are
 desired in the Lords Prayer, *aliis atque aliis verbis*, some-
 times one way, and sometimes another; And before this
 in his *de Idolol.* place of *Iust. Mar. Apo. 2.* He, who in-
 structed the people, prayed according to his ability. Nor was
 this liberty in prayer taken away, and set and imposed
 formes introduced, untill the time that the Arians and
 Pelagians Hereticks did invade the Church, and then be-
 cause these Hereticks did convy and sprede their poi-
 son in their formes of Prayer and Hymnes, the Church
 thought it convenient to restraints the liberty of making
 and using publique formes; And first it ordained that
 none should pray *pro Arbitrio, sed semper eadem preces*,
 that none should use liberty to vary in prayer, but use al-
 waies the same forme, *Conc. Laod. Can. 18.* yet this was a
 forme of his owne composing, as appears by another
 Canon, wherein it was ordered thus; None should use
 any forme unless he had first conferred *Cum fratribus in-
 fructuosis*; with the more learned of his brethren. *Conc.
 Carth. 3. Can. 23.* and lastly that none should use set pray-
 ers, but such as were approved of in a Synode, which was
 not determined till the yeare 416. *Conc. Milov. 2. Can. 12.*
 And had there been any Liturgies of Times of the first
 and most venerable antiquity producible, the great ad-
 mirers of them, and inquirers after them would have pre-
 sented them to the world ere this.

*Tert. Apo.
ad Gen. c. 39.*

*Iust. Mar.
Apost. 2.
logizet in
dignis an-
ticipat.*

*Conc. La.
Can. 18.*

*Conc. Carth.
3. Can. 23.
Anno 397.*

*Conc. Mi-
lev. 2.
Can. 12. An.
416.*

we know that *Bishop Andrews* in his zeale for Liturgies pursued the inquiry after the *Jewish Liturgie* so far, that he thought he had found it; and one there was which he sent to *Cambridge* to be translated: but there it was soone discovered, to have beene made long after the *Jewes* ceased to be the Church of God; and so himselfe suppress it, that it never saw the light under a translation.

Pag. 10.

We wonder therefore, what this Remonstrant meant to affirme so confidently, that *part of the forme of prayer which was composed by our blessed Saviour, was borrowed from the formes of prayer formerly used by Gods people*. An opinion we never met before; indeed, we have read that the *Rabbines* since the daies of our Saviour have borrowed some expressions from that *Prayer*, and from other *Evangelicall passages*: But we never read till now, that the *Lord Christ* the *wisdome of the Father* borrowed from the *wisdome of the Rabbines* expressions to use in *Prayer*.

Pag. 11.

And as much we wonder by what *Revelation or Tradition* (Scripture being silent in the thing) he knew, that *Peter and Iohn*, when they went up to the Temple to pray, their *Prayer* was not of a *sudden and extemporary conception*, but of a *Regular prescription*. Sure we are some as well read in *Jewish antiquity*, as this Remonstrant shewes himselfe to be; have told us that the *houre of Prayer* was the time when the *Priest* burnt *Incense*; and the people were at their private prayers without, as appeares, *Luke 1. 9.* where we reade, that while *Zachary* the *Priest* went in to offer *Incense*, all the people stood without praying in the time of the *Oblation*. Which *Prayers* were so far from being *Prescript Formes* or *Liturgies* that they were not *vocall* but *mentall Prayers*, as *Master Meade* tels us in his exposition upon the eighth of the *Revelations*.

Pag. 18.

And what ever *Peter and Iohn* did, this we know, that when the *Publican* and the *Pharisee* went up to the Temple to pray (as the *Apostles* did at the *houre of prayer*) their prayer was not of *Regular prescription*, but of a *present Conception*.

But

But if this Remonstrant be in the right, concerning the Jewish Liturgies, then the Evangelicall Church might better have improved her peace and happinesse, then in composing Models of Invocation and Thanksgiving, when there is one extant and ready to be produced, that was constantly used by Gods people ever since Moses daies, and put over to the times of the Gospel and confirmed by Apostolicall practise: or else great is our losse, who are so unhappily deprived of the best improvement, the Church made of her peace and happinesse in the first 300. yeares: for rejecting those Liturgies that are confest by the Learned to be Spurious; We challenge this Remonstrant to produce any one Liturgie that was the issue of those times. And blessed Constantine was herein as unhappy as we, who needed not have composed formes of prayer for his Guard to use upon the Lords day, but might and would have taken them out of former Liturgies, if there had been any; And can ye with patience think that any ingenuous Christian should be so transported, as upon such weak and unproved premises to build such a Confident conclusion, as this Remonstrant doth? and in that Conclusion forget the state of the controversie sliding from the question of a prescribed and imposed Liturgie to an arbitrary book of prayer.

In his Rhetoricall Encomium of conceived prayer wee shall more willingly bear a part with him, then they whose cause he pleads; for had that been in their hearts, which is in this book: to hate, to be guilty of pouring water upon the Spirit, and gladly to adde oyle rather: so many learned, able, Conscientious Preachers had not been molested and suspended, for letting the constant flames of their fixed conceptions mount up from the altar of their zealous heart unto the throne of grace: nor had there been so many advantages watched from some stops and seeming solecismes in some mens prayers, to blaspheme the spirit of prayer, which though now confest to be so far from being offensive, that they are as pleasing Musick in the eares of the Almighty: yet time hath been, when they have sounded as meere Barrologies; nay no better then meere Blasphemies in the eares of some Bishops.

Pag. 11.

Euseb. de
vit. Con. li.
4. cap. 18.

Pag. 11.

Pag. 12.

Pag. 12.

Pag. 13.

D. Corbet.
M. Novel.

And if this conceived prayer be not to be opposed in another, by any man that hath found the true operation of this grace in himselfe : with that spirit then are those posselt, that have not only thus rag'd with their tongues against this way of prayer : but by sealing up the mouthes of Ministers for praying thus in publike, and imposing penances upon private Christians for praying thus in their Families : and compelling them to *abjure* this practise, have endeavoured with raging violence to banish this divine ordinance from our Churches and dwellings, and profest in open Court : it was fitter for *Amsterdam* than for our Churches.

Pag. 13.

But howsoever this applause of conceived prayer may seeme to be Cordiall, yet he makes it but a *vantage ground* to lift up *publike formes of sacred Church Liturgie* (as hee calls it) the higher, that they may have the greater *honour*, that by the *power of your authority they be reinforced*, which worke there would have beene no need to call your *Honours* to, had not *Episcopall zeale* broke forth into such flames of indignation against conceived prayers, that we have more just cause to implore the *propitious aide* of the same *Authority* to *reestablishe the Liberty* of this, then they to *re-inforce* the necessity of that.

Pag. 13.

Yet there are two specious Arguments which this Remonstrant brings to perswade this desired re-inforcement, the Originall and Confirmation of our Liturgie.

For the first, he tels your *Honours*, it was selected out of ancient Models not ROMAN but CHRISTIAN, contrived by the holy Martyrs and Confessors of the blessed reformation of Religion; where we beseech your *Honours* to consider how we may trust these men, who sometimes speaking and writing of the ROMAN Church, proclaime it a true Church of CHRIST, and yet here ROMAN and CHRISTIAN stand in opposition: sometimes they tell men, their Liturgie is wholly taken out of the *Romane Missall*, only with some little alteration : and here they would perswade your *Honours* there is nothing *Romane* in

in it. But it is wholly selected out of pure *Ancient Models*, as the *Quintessence* of them all. Whereas alas the originall of it, is published to the world, in that Proclamation of *Edward the sixth*.

And though here they please to stile the Composers of it, *holy Martyrs, and contrivers of the blessed Reformation*: yet there are of the *Tribe* for whom he pleads, not a few that have called them *Traitors* rather than *Martyrs*, and *Deformers* rather than *Reformers* of our Religion.

His other Argument for the Liturgie is taken from that supply of strength, it hath received from the recommendation of four most Religious Princes, & your own Parliamentary establishments: and more especially from the Proclamation of King James of famous memory: the validity of which plea, your Honors are best able to judge, and therefore we leave it at your Bar; yet these two things we know: first, that this form was never established to be so punctually observed, so rigorously pressed, to the casting out of all that scruple it, or any thing in it (as many of his Majesties Subjects now doe) to the (almost) justling out of the preaching of the Word, and Conceived Prayer altogether.

Pag. 13, 14.

And secondly, as sure we are, that your Honors thinke neither your own Lawes, nor the Proclamation of that most famous and ever admired Prince, to be as unalterable as the Lawes of the *Medes and Persians*.

And now having briefly shewed, that *Liturgies* are not of that antiquity that this *Romanist* pretends, but that conceived prayer was in use in the Church of God before *Liturgies*, and is justified from their own mouths, and not to be found fault with by any but a gracelesse man: and having likewise shewed that our *Liturgie* was taken out of *Models*, not only *Christian* but *Romane*, and hath since the first compiling of it suffered alteration to the worse; and though established by Law, and confirmed by Proclamation, was never intended to the justling out, either of preaching or conceived prayer, these things declared, we humbly crave your Honors leave to propound these two *Queries*.

Whether it be not fit to consider of the alteration of the present Liturgie.

1 First, because it symbolizeth so much with the Popish Masse, as that the Pope himselfe was willing to have it used, if he might but confirme it.

2 It was made and composed into this frame, on purpose to bring the Papists to our Churches, which we finde to be with so little successe, as that it hath rather brought many of us to them, then any of them to us, and hath lost many of ours from us.

3 Because many things therein contained are stumbling blocks before the feet of many: such as these, the clogging it with Ceremonies, and the often and impertinent reiterating of the Lords Prayer, the ill translation of the Psalmes, and other Scriptures, the many phrases in the very prayers, which are liable to just exception. And whereas the Minister by the Scripture is the peoples mouth to God, this booke prescribes Responsories to be said by the people, some of which are unsutable to what the Minister pronounceth, some of them seeme to savour of Tautologie, some are made to be so essentiall to the prayer, as that all which the Minister saith, is no prayer without them; as in the *Letany*.

4 Because it is so much Idolized, as that it is accounted the only worship of God in *England*, and is now made the upholder of a non preaching Ministry, and is cryed up to that height, as that some are not ashamed to say, that the wit of men and Angels cannot mend it: and that it is a sufficient discharge of the Ministers duty to reade this Booke.

Abbot against
Church tor-
sakers.

5 There are such multitudes of people, that distaste this booke, that unlesse it be altered, there is no hope of any mutuall agreement between Gods Ministers and their people.

6 There is such a vaite difference betweene it, and the Li-
turgie

urgies of all other reformed Churches, as that it keepes them at a distance from us, and us from full Communion with them.

QUIRE II.

Whether the first-reformers of Religion did ever intend the use of a Liturgie further, then to be an help, in the want, or to the weaknesse of a Minister.

All other reformed Churches, though they use Liturgies, yet doe not binde their Ministers to the use of them.

A Rubric in King Edwards booke left it unto the discretion of the Minister, what and how much to reade, when there was a Sermon.

The Homilies which are appointed to be read, are left free either to be read or not, by preaching Ministers, and why not then the Liturgie? especially considering that the ability to offer up the peoples wants to God in prayer is part of the Ministeriall office, as well as preaching. And if it can be thought no lesse than sacriledge, to rob the people of the Ministers gift in preaching, and to tie them to Homilies, it can be no lesse, to deprive them of their gift in prayer.

The ground of the first binding of it upon all to use, was not to tie godly men from exercising their gift in prayer; but the old popish Priests, that by a seeming returne to our Religion, did through indulgence retaine their places; from returning to the old Masse.

That which makes many refuse to be present at our Church service, is not only the Liturgie it selfe, but the imposing of it upon Ministers. And we finde no way to recover our people to a stinted prayer, but by leaving it free to use or not to use.

If it be objected, that this will breed divisions and disturbances in Churches, unlesse there be a uniformity, and that there are many unable.

It hath not bred any disturbance in other reformed Churches.

Why

1

2

3

4

5

Ob.

Ans.

2 Why should the free liberty of using or not using a Liturgie, breed more confusion than the free liberty of reading or not reading Homilies, especially when Ministers shall teach people, not to condemne one another in things indifferent.

3 If there be a care taken in those that have the power to make Ministers, to choose men gifted as well for prayer as preaching, there cannot be conceived how any inconvenience should follow. Or if afterwards it should appear, that any Minister should prove insufficient to discharge the duty of prayer in a conceived way, it may bee imposed on him as a punishment, to use set formes, and no other. But why any Minister that hath the gift of prayer, in an abundant measure, as well as of preaching, should be hindered from exercising his gift well, because another useth it ill, is a new Divinity never heard of in Gods Church, till Bishop Wrens daies, who forbad all use of conceived prayer in the Church.

SECT. III.

WE come now with your Honours favour, to the second point disputed in this Remonstrance; *Episcopacy it selfe*: against which whatsoever hath been either spoken or written by any, either *learned Divines*, or *well reformed Churches* (as his conscience knowes, there are of both that have writ against it) is Taxed by him as no other then the *unjust Clamors* either of *weak or factious persons*. Sure the man thinkes he hath obtained a *Monopoly* of learning, and all *Knowledge* is lockt up in his *bosome*; and not only *Knowledge* but *piety* and *peaceableness* too; for all that are not of his opinion, must suffer either as *weake* or *factious*, if he may be their Iudge. We know not what this *Arrogancy* might attempt to fasten upon your Honors, should the *bowels* of your compassion bee enlarged, to weigh in the *Ballance* of your *wisdomes*, the *multitude* of *Humble petitions*, presented to you from severall parts of this Kingdome, that hath long groaned under the

Pag. 17.

Pag. 17.

the Iron and Insupporable yoke of this *Episcopall Government*, which yet we doubt not, but your *Honours* will please to take into your prudent and pious consideration; Especially knowing it is their continuall practise to loade with the odious names of *Faction* all that justly complain of their *unjust oppression*.

In his addresse to his defence of Episcopacy, he makes *Pag. 17.*
an unhappy confession *that he is confounded in himselfe.*

Your Honours may in this beleve him, for hee that reads this Remonstrance, may easily observe so many falsties and contradictions, (though presented to publike view, with a face of confident boldnesse,) as could not fall from the Pen of any, but *selfe-confounded man*: which though we doubt not but your *Honours* have descryed; yet because they are hid from an errant, and unobserving eye, under the Embroyderies of a silken Language, wee Humbly crave your Honours leave to put them one by one upon the file, that the world may see what credit is to be given to the bold assertions of this confident Remonstrant.

First, in his second page, he dubs his Book ** the faithfull messenger of all the peaceable and right affected sons of the Church of England*: which words (besides that unchristian *Theta*, which as we already observed, they set upon all that are not of his party,) carry in the bowels of them a notorious fallity and contradiction to the phrase of the booke; for how could this booke be the messenger of all *his owne party* in England, when it is not to be imagined, that all could know of the comming forth of this booke before it was published: and how can that booke crave admittance in *all their names*, that speakes in the singular number, and as in the person of one man almost the whole booke thorow.

But it may be some will say this is but a small slippe; well be it so: but in the seventh page hee layes it on in foure lines, asserting these foure things: First, that *Episcopall Government*, (that very same Episcopall Government, which some *he saith* seekes to wound,

** Pag. 2.*

One of these Sonnes of the Church of England whose messenger this Remonstrance is, was he who swore by the Eternall God, he would be the death of those that did appeare to move against the grievances of Episcopacy, and if the rest of these Millions mentioned *pag. 2.* whose thousands are so punctually calculated *p. 41.* be of his spirit: they are an army of very peaceable & right affected men.

2
Pag. 7.

that is Government by Diocesan Bishops) derives it selfe from the Apostles times; which though we shall not more fully confute anon, yet we cannot here but ranke it among his notorious: for how could there be such Government of a Diocesse by a Bishop derived from the Apostles times: when in the Apostles times there were no Bishops distinct from Presbyters, as we shall shew, and if there had bene Bishops, yet they were no Diocesans, for it was a hundred yeares after Christ, or as most agree 260. before Parishes were distinguished, and there must be a distinction of Parishes before there could be an union of them into Diocesses.

Secondly, it is by the joyned confession of all reformed Divines granted, that this sacred Government is derived from the Apostles: What all reformed Divines? was Calvin, Beza, Junius, &c. of that minde? Are the reformed Churches of France, Scotland, Netherlands, of that Iudgement? we shall shew anon that there is no more Truth in this Assertion then if he had said with *Anaxagoras*, snow is black, or with *Copernicus*, the Earth moves, and the heavens stand still.

Thirdly, he saith this Government hath continued without any interruption: What doth he meane, at Rome? for we reade in some places of the world this Government was never known for many yeares together: as in Scotland, we reade that in Ancient times the Scots were instructed in the Christian faith by Priests and Monkes, and were without Bishops 290. yeares: yea to come to England, we would desire to know of this Remonstrant whether God had a Church in England in *Q. Marias* daies or no? and if so, who were then the Bishops of this Church, for somewhere must be, if it be true that this man saith, this Government hath continued without any interruption unto this day; and Bishops then we know not where to finde but in the line of Popish succession.

Fourthly, he saith it hath thus continued without the contradiction of any one Congregation in the Christian world. It seemes he hath forgotten, what their own darling

Heylin

Evaristus

100. to 200.

Dionysius

260.

Some say

267. as *Pel.*

Virg.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

Heylin hath written of the people of Biscay in Spaine, that they admit of no Bishops to come among them, for when Ferdinand the Catholike came in progresse accompanied among others with the Bishop of Pampelone, the people rose up in Armes, drove back the Bishop, and gathering up all the dust which they thought he had trode on, flung it into the Sea.

Heylins
Geog. p. 55.

Which story had it been recorded only by him, would have been of lighter Credit. But we read the same in the Spanish Chronicle, who saith more then the Doctor, for he tels us that the People threw that dust that the Bishop or his Mule had trode on, into the Sea with *Curses and Imprecations*: which certainly saith he was not done without some *Mysterie*, those people not being voide of Religion, but superstitiously devout as the rest of the Spaniards are: so that they is one Congregation in the Christian world in which this Government hath met with contradiction.

Gener. Hist.
of Spain l. 22

And are not the *French, Scottish, and Belgicke* Churches worthy to be counted Christian Congregations, and who knows not that amongst these this Government hath met not only with verball, but reall contradiction?

Yet he cannot leave his ----: But within two pages is at it again; and tels us of an unquestionable clearnesse wherein it hath been from the Apostles derived to us, how unquestionable? when the many volumes written about it, witnesse to the world, and to his conscience, it hath been as much questioned as any point (almost) in our Religion.

6
Pag. 9.

And that assertion of his that tels us that the people of God had a forme of prayer as ancient as Moses, which was constantly practised to the Apostles dayes, and by the Apostles, &c. though we have shewed how bold and false this assertion is, yet we mention it here as deserving to be put into the Catalogue.

7

And that he may not seeme *Contra Mentem ire*: but to be of the same minde still, p. 18. he saith Episcopall Government hath continued in this Island ever since the first plantation

8
Pag. 18.

plantation of the Gospell without contradiction. Had he taken a lesse space of time, and said but since the resurrection of the Gospell: we can prove it to him and shall, that since the reformation, Episcopacy hath been more contradicted, then ever the Papacy was before the extirpation of it.

9 Yet still the man runs on, thinking to get credit to his untruthes by their multiplications, for pag. 21. hee saith; *Certainly except all Histories, all Authors saile us, nothing can be more certain then this truth: O Durum! Nothing more certain: what is it not more certain that there is a God? is it not more certain that Christ is God and man? is it not more certaine that Christ is the onely Saviour of the world? Nothing more certaine: must this then be an Article of our Creede, the corner stone of our Religion: must this be of necessity to Salvation? Nothing more certaine. O that men should not onely forget themselves, but God also: And in their zeale for their owne Honour utter words bordering upon Blasphemy.*

Indignation will not suffer us to prosecute these falsities of his any further; wee will leave this displeasing service, onely retorting the words of this Remonstrant upon himselfe; *Surely could hee looke with our eyes (or any eyes that were not partiall) he would see cause to bee thoroughly ashamed of these his grosse injurious miscarriages, and should be forced to confesse, that never good cause (if cause be good) had more reason to complaine of a sinfull prosecution.*

Pag. 18.

SECT. IV.

WE will now come with your Honours patience to weigh, whether there be any more strength in his arguments, then there is truth in his assertions.

His Plea for Episcopacy consists of two parts. In the first he brings arguments for the supporting of it. In the second he undertakes to answer the objections that may be made against it.

His first argument for it, is couched in these words;

Were

In which words he speaks two things, which deserve just censure. First, that the Hierarchicall Government hath continued for fifteene hundred yeares, therefore should not now be altered, which may well be called, as *Hierome* in another Case; *Argumentū Galeatum*, an argument calculated for the Meridian of Episcopacy, and may indifferently serve for all Religions in the world: For thus the Jewes might have pleaded against Christ the Antiquity of more then so many hundred yeares; and thus the Heathens did plead against the Christian Religion, which *Iustin Martyr* in his Apology answers. And by this Argument the Pope sits as fast rivetted in his chayre at Rome, as ours in theirs: whose plea for Antiquity runs parallell with theirs. It is a good observation of *Cyprian*, that

a Frustra con-
suetudinē nobis
opponunt, quam
β consuetudo
major sit vici-
tare, aut non id
sit in spirituali-
bus siquendum,
quod in melius
fuerit à Spiritu
in Sancto Re-
velatum, ys 2
pr Ep. 73. 1663
b It is well obs-
served by Ger-
hard, that a
Bishop pbraße

C 3

and

81.2

and them. And that as King *James*, of famous memory, said of the Religion of *England*, that it differed no more from Rome, than Rome did from what it was at first; may as truly be said of Bishops, that we differ no more from them, then they doe from what Bishops were, when first they were raised unto this eminency: which difference we shall shew in our ensuing Discourse, to be so great, that as he said of Rome, he did *Romam in Roma querere*, he sought Rome in Rome; so we *Episcopatum in Episcopatu*, may go seek for a Bishop among all our Bishops.

Pag. 19.

And whereas in his application of this Argument to the Bishops of this Nation, he saith, *It hath continued in this Island ever since the first plantation of the Gospel, without contradiction*; which is his Second in this Argument: How false this is we have declared already, and we all know, and himselfe cannot but know, that there is no one thing since the reformation, that hath met with so much Contradiction as Episcopacy hath done; witness the severall Bookes, written in the Reignes of our severall Princes, and the many Petitions exhibited to our severall Parliaments, and the many speeches made therein against Episcopall Government: many of which are yet extant.

Pag. 19.

a What the establishment of Episcopacy by the Lawes is, and upon what grounded, the learned Sir Edward Cooke informes

As for that supply of Accessory strength, which he begs to this Argument, from the *light of nature, and the rules of iust policy, which* (saith he) *teacheth us not easily to give way to the change of those things, which long use and many Lawes have firmly established, as Necessary and Beneficiall*; it is evident, that those things which to former Ages have seemed Necessary and Beneficiall, may to succeeding Generations, prove not Necessary but Noxious, not Beneficiall but Burthensome. And then the same *light of nature*,

us, who reports, That in an Act of Parliament holden at *Carlisle* in the 25. yeare of *Edw. 1.* it is declared that the holy Church of *England* was founded in the state of Prelacy within the Realme of *England*, by the King and his Progenitours, &c. for them to informe the people in the Law of God; and to keep ospitality, and give almes, and do other workes of charity. And the said Kings in times past were wont to have their advise and counsell for the safe-guard of the Realme, when they had need of such Prelates and Claikes so advanced. *Cooke de Jure Regis Ecclesiastico*. But whether Bishops have observed the Orders of their first foundation, &c.

and

and the same *just policy*, that did at the first command the establishment of them, may and will perswade their *abolishment*; if not, either our Parliaments must never Repeale any of their former Acts (which yet they have justly and wisely done) or else in so doing must run Counter to the *light of nature*, and the *Rules of just policy*; which to think were an impiety to be punished by the Iudge.

SECT. V.

THE Second Argument for the defence of Episcopall government, is from the *Pedigree of this holy Calling*, which he derives from no lesse than an *Apostolicall*, and in that, *right divine institution*; and assayes to prove it from the practice of the Apostles; and as he saith, the *cleare practice of their Successors*, continued in *Christs Church* to this very day: and to this Argument he so much confides, that he concludes it with this *Triumphant Epiphonema*, *What scruple can remain in any ingenuous heart? And determines, if any continue yet unsatisfied, it is in desphight of reason, and all evidence of History, and because he wilfully shuts his eyes, with a purpose not to see the light. Bona verba.*

Pag. 19, 20.

Pag. 21.

By your favour Sir, we will tell you notwithstanding the supposed strength of your argumentation, there is one scruple yet remaining, and if you would know upon what ground, it is this, because we finde in Scripture (which by your own Confession is *Originall Authority*) that Bishops and Presbyters were *Originally* the same, though afterwards they came to be distinguished: and in procelle of time, Episcopacy did swallow up all the *honor and power* of the *Presbytery*; as *Pharaohs* lean Kine did the fat.

Pag. 8.

Their Identity is discernable; first, from the same names given unto both; secondly from the same office, designed unto both in Scripture. As for the names, are not the same names given unto both in sacred Writ? Let the fifth, sixth, and seventh verses of the first Chapter to *Titus* testifie: in the fifth verse, the Apostle shewes that he left *Titus* in *Greet* to ordaine Elders in every City: in the sixth

sixth verse, he gives a delineation of the persons that are capable of such Ordination: and in the seventh, the Reason, why the person to be ordained, must be so qualified; for a Bishop, &c. Now if the Bishop and Elder be not here the same, but names of distinct office and order, the Apostles reason rendered in the seventh verse of his direction in the fifth and sixth verses, is (with reverence be it spoken) inconsequentiall, and his demand unjust. If a Chancellor in one of the Universities should give Order to his Vice-chancellour to admit none to the decree of Batchelour in Arts, but such as were able to preach, or keepe a Divinity Act; For Batchelours in Divinity must be so; what reason or equity were in this? So if Paul leaving Titus as his *Locum tenens*, as it were in Crete for a season, should give order to him not to admit any to be an Elder but one thus and thus qualified, because a Bishop must be so: Had a Bishop been an Order or Calling distinct from, or superiour to a Presbyter, and not the same, this had been no more rationall or equall then the former; therefore under the name of Bishop in the seventh verse the Apostle intends the Elder, mentioned in the fifth verse. Consonant to this is the Language of the same blessed Apostle, *Acts 20.* verse 17. 18. where such as in 17 verse he calls *episcopoi*, *Elders* in the 28. he calls *presbyters*, in ordinary English, *Bishops*, though our Translation there, (we know not for what reason) reads it *Overseers*; not so rendering the word in any other Text.

And though this Remonstrant undertakes to shew a cleare and received distinction, of *Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons*, as three distinct subordinate Callings in Gods Church, with an evident specification of the duty & charge belonging to each of them; or els let this claimed Hierarchy be for ever hooted out of the Church: Yet let us tell him, that we never find in Scripture these 3 Orders, *Bishops, Presbyters & Deacons*, mentioned together: but onely *Bishops & Deacons*, as *Phil. 1.* and *1 Tim.* Nor do we finde in Scripture any Ordination to the office of a Bishop, differing frō the Ordination of an Elder: Nor do we finde in Scripture, the

the specification of any *Duty* charged upon a *Bishop*, that *Elders* are secluded from: Nor any *qualification* required in a *Bishop*, that is not requisite in every *Presbyter*; some of which, if not all, would be found, were they not the same.

But if this *Remonstrant* thinke to helpe himselfe by taking Sanctuary in *Antiquity* (though we would gladly rest in *Scripture*, the Sanctuary of the Lord) yet we will follow him thither, and there shew him that *Hierome* from the *Scriptures* proves more then once, *Presbyters* and *Bishops* to be the same. And *Chrysostome* in *Philip. 1. Homil. 2.* with his admirer *Theophilact* in *Philip. 1.* affirms that while the *Apostles* lived, the Names of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were not distinguished: and not only while the *Apostles* lived, but in after ages. Doth not *Irenaeus* use the name of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* *adaupitus*, in a promiscuous sence. Are not *Anicetus*, *Pius*, *Hyginus*, *Telephorus*, *Sixtus*, whom the *Papists* call *Bishops*, and the popes predecessors, termed by *Eusebius* *presbyters*? Nor was it strange in the primitive times to heare *Bishops* called *presbyters*, when *Presbyters* writing to their *Bishops* have called him *Frater*. So *Cyprian* (*Epist. 26.* in the beginning) is stiled by his *Presbyters*, *Deacons* and confessors, nor was that holy Martyr offended with that title, nor they condemned of insolency that used it.

Hierony. Ep. ad Enag. & ad Ocea.

Iren. adver. her. l. 4. cap. 43. 44.

Hist. Lib. 5. Cap. 23.

But what should we burthen your patience with more testimonies? when the evidence of this truth hath shined with so strong a beame, that even our *Adversaries* have stooped to it, and confessed that their Names were the same in the *Apostles* time. But yet say they, the *Offices* were distinct.

Bellarmin. de Cleric. Lib. 1. cap. 15.

Now here wee would gladly know, what these men make the distinct Office of a *Bishop*.

Is it to edifie the Church by word and Sacrament? is it to ordaine others to that worke? is it to rule, to governe, by admonition and other censures? if any of these, if all these make up the proper worke of a *Bishop*; we can prove from *Scripture* that all these belong

• Presbyteris
sicut Episcopis
Dispensatio

into the Presbytery, which is no more then was granted
by a Councell^a.

*Mysterium Dei commissum est: Presunt enim Ecclesie Christi: in Consecratione Domini
corporis & sanguinis, consortes sunt cum Episcopis: & similiter in Doctrina Populorum & in
officio predicandi: ac solum propter auctoritatem, summo Sacerdoti Clericorum Ordinatio refer-
vata est: Concil. Aquisgran. primum, Can. 8.*

*Evangelium tribuit his qui presunt Ecclesie Mandatum docendi Evangelii, remittendi
peccata, administrandi Sacramenta: praeterea jurisdictionem; videlicet Mandatum Ex-
communicandi eos quorum nota sunt crimina, & Resipiscere rursus absolvendi: Ac
Omnium Confessione, etiam adversariorum licet, hanc potestatem Jure Divino com-
munem esse Omnibus qui presunt Ecclesie, sive Pastores vocentur, sive Presbyteri,
Sive Episcopi. Scriptum Philip. Melanch. in Conventu Smalcald. Anno. 1540. a precipuis
illarum Ecclesiarum Doctoribus communi Consensu comprobatione de potestate & jurisdictione
Episcoporum.*

I. For the first, Edifying of the Church by word and Sa-
craments, though we feare they will some of them at least
scarcely owne this as *their proper worke* (for some have beene
cite into the High Commission for saying, it belongs to
them) yet Sir we are sure, Scripture makes it a part, a chiefe
of the Episcopall office; for so in the 1 Pet 5. 2. they are
said to doe the worke of a Bishop, when they doe feede
the flocke of God. And this is such a worke as we hope
their Lordships will give the poore Presbyters leave to
share with them in: or if not, we will tell them that the
Apostle Peter in that forecited place, and the Apostle
Paul, Acts. 20. binds this worke upon our hands, and *Woe*
unto us if we preach not the Gospel.

But this branch of Episcopall and Presbyteriall office
we passe with brevity, because in this there lies not so
much controversie as in the next; which they doe more
wholly *impropriate* to themselves: the power of Ordina-
tion.

Which power, that it was in former times in the hands
of Presbyters appears 1 Tim. 4. 14. *Neglect not the gift
which was given thee by Prophecie, and by the laying on of the
hands of the Presbytery.* The gift here spoken of is the Mi-
nisteriall gift, the exercise whereof, the Apostle exhorts
Timothy not to neglect, which saith he, 'he had received,

not

not by the laying on of the hands of one single man, whether *Apostle*, or *Bishop*, or *Presbyter*; But *to presbytery* the Presbytery, that is, the whole company of Presbyters, for in that sense onely wee finde *πρεσβυτηριον* taken in Scripture, as in *Luke 22. vers. 66. Act. 22. vers. 5.* which the Christian Church called the *Ecclesiasticall Senate*, as *Ierom* in *Isay 3. Nos habemus in Ecclesia Senatum nostrum, Catum Presbyterorum*, & an *Apostolicall Senate*: *συνηριον Αποστολων* *Ierom. Isa. 3.* *Ignatius Epis. ad Magnes*: and some times *πρεσβυτηριον*, *Con-* *Ignat. Epis. ad*
cil. Ancyr. Can. 18. *Magnes.*

And though the Apostle in his second Epistle to *Tim.* *Conc. Ancyr.*
1. 6. makes mention of the laying on of his hands; yet *Can. 18,*
 to maintaine the Harmony of Scripture, it must not be denied, but there was imposition of hands by the Presbytery, as well as by himselfe, & so it was a joynt act; So that in this there is no more difference then in the former.

And if there be no difference betweene Presbyters in feeding or ordaining, let us see if there be any in the third part of their office of *Ruling*, which though our *Bishops* assume wholly to themselves, yet we shall discover, that it hath beene committed to and exercised by *Presbyteriall* hands.

For who are they of whom the Scripture speakes, *Heb.*
13. 17. Obey them that have the Rule over you, for they watch
for your soules, as they that must give an account, &c.

Here all such as watch over the soules of Gods people, are intituled to rule over them. So that unlesse *Bishops* will say, that they only watch over the soules of Gods people, and are only to give an account for them: they cannot challenge to themselves the sole rule over them. And if the *Bishops* can give us good security, that they will acquit us from giving up our account to God for the soules of his people, we will quit our plea, and resigne to them the sole rule over them.

So againe in the *1 Thessa. 5. 12. Know them which labour amongst you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you.*

In which words are contained these truthes; First that

in one Church (for the *Thessalonians* were but one Church, 1 *Co.*) there was not *ὁ ἑστὶς ἀπὸ πάντων*: but *οἱ δευτέρως ἀπὸ πάντων*; not one chiefe Bishop or President, but the Presidency was in many.

2. Secondly, that this presidency was of such as laboured in the word and Doctrine.

3. Thirdly, that the Censures of the Church were managed not by one, but by them all in Communi. *Them that admonish you.*

4. Fourthly, that there was among them a Parity, for the Apostles bids *know them* in an Indifferency, not discriminating one from another: yea such was the rule that Elders had, that S. Peter thought it needfull to make an exhortation to them to use their power with Moderation, not Lording it over Gods Heritage, 1 *Pet.* 5.3.

By this time we have sufficiently proved from Scripture, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same in name, in Office, in Edifying the Church, in power of Ordination and Iurisdiction; we summe up all that hath beene spoken in one argument.

They which have the same Name, the same Ordination to their Office, the same qualification for their Office, the same worke to feede the flock of God, to ordaine pastors and Elders, to Rule, and Governe; they are one and the same Office: but such are Bishops and presbyters, Ergo.

SECT. VI.

BUt the dint of all this Scripture, the Remonstrant would elude, by obtruding upon his reader a commentary (as he calls it) of the Apostles own practise (which hee would force to contradict their own rules) to which he superadds the unquestionable glosse of the cleare practise of their immediate successors in this administration. For the Apostles practise, we have already discovered it, from the Apostles own writings; and for his Glosse he superadds, if it corrupts not the Text we shall admit it; but if it doe, we must answer with Tertullian, *Id verum quodcumq;* pri-

Pag. 20.

Tertull.

imum

mum: id adulterum quod posterius, whatsoever is first is true; but that which is latter is adulterous.

In the examination of this Glosse; to avoyd needlesse Controversie. First, wee take for granted by both sides, that the first and best Antiquitie, used the *names of Bishops and Presbyters* promiscuously. Secondly, that in proceesse of time, some one was honoured with the name of *Bishop* and the rest were called *Presbyters* or *Cleri*. Thirdly, that this was not *Nomen inane*, but there was some kinde of Imparity betweene him and the rest of the Presbyters.

Yet in this we differ; that they say, this *Impropriation* of name, and *Imparity of place*, is of *Divine Right and Apostolicall Institution*: we affirme both to be occasionall, and of humane Invention; and undertake to shew out of Antiquitie, both the *occasion upon which*, and the *Persons by whom this Imparity* was brought into the Church.

On our parts stands *Jerome* and *Ambrose*, and others, whom we doubt not but our Remonstrant wil grant a place among his Glossators: *Saint Jerome* tells us in *1 Tit.*

Idem est ergo Presbyter qui Episcopus: & antequam Diaboli instinctu, studia in Religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego Cepha, Communi Presbyterorum Consilio ecclesia gubernabantur. Postquam vero unusquisq; eos quos baptizaverat suos putabat esse, non Christi; in toto Orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesie Cura pertineret, & schismatum semina

A Presbyter and a Bishop is the same: and before there were through the Devils instinct, divisions in Religion, and the people began to say, I am of *Paul*, and I of *Apollo*, and I of *Cephas*, The Churches were governed by the Common Counsell of the Presbyters: But after that each man began to account those whom hee had baptized his owne, and not Christs; it was decreed thorow the whole world, that one of the Presbyters should be set over the rest; to whom the Care of all the Church should belong, that the

tollerantur. Putat aliquis seeds of schisme might be taken non Scripturarum, sed away. Thinkes any, that this is stram esse sententiam, Epi- my opinion, and not the opini- scopum & Presbyterum in- on of the Scripture, that a Bi- nunt esse, & aliud atque, shop and an Elder is the same, aliud esse nomen officii, re- let him reade the words of the legat Apostoli ad Philip- Apostle to the *Philippians*, say- penses verba, dicentis, Pau- ing, *Paul* and *Timothy*, the ser- lus & *Timotheus* servi Je- vants of *Jesus Christ*, to them su Christi qui sunt Phi- that are at *Philippi*, with the Bi- lippis, cum Episcopis & shops & Deacons. *Philippi* is one Diaconis, &c. *Philippi* a City of *Macedonia*, and certain- na est urbs Macedonia, & ly in one Citie there could not certe in una Civitate non be many Bishops (as they are now poterant plures esse (ut nun- called &c.) and after the allegan- cupantur) Episcopi, &c. fi- tions of many other Scriptures, cut ergo Presbyteri sciunt he concludes thus, as the Elders se ex Ecclesie consuetudine therefore may know, that they ei qui sibi propositus fuerit are to be subject to him that is esse subjectos; Ita Episcopi set over them by the Custome of noverint se magis consuetu- the Church; so let the Bishops dine, quam dispositionis Do- know, that it is more from custome, minica veritate Presbyte- then from any true dispensation ris esse majores, & in Com- from the Lord, that they are above muni debere Ecclesiam re- the Presbyters, and that they ought gere. to rule the Church in common.

In which words of *Jerome*, these five things present them- selves to the Readers view;

1. First, that Bishops and Presbyters are originally the same; *Idem ergo est Presbyter qui Episcopus.*
2. Secondly, that that Imparitie that was in his time be- tweene Bishops and Elders, was grounded upon Ecclesia- sticall Custome, and not upon divine Institution; *Episcopi noverint, &c.*
3. Thirdly, that this was not his private judgement, but the judgement of Scripture; *Putat aliquis, &c.*
4. Fourthly, that before this Prioritie was upon this occa- sion

sion stated, the Church was governed *Communi Presbyterorum Consilio*, by the Counsell of the presbyters in common, and that even after this imparity, it ought to be so governed; *Sciant Episcopi se Ecclesiam debere in communi regere.*

Fifthly, that the occasion of this Imparity and Superiority of Bishops above Elders, was the divisions which through the Devils instinct fell among the Churches; *Postquam vero Diaboli instinctu.*

Savaria would take advantage of this place, to deduce this Imparity as high as from the Apostles times, because even then they began to say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos*; but sure *S. Ierome* was not so weak as this man would make him, to speake Inconsistencies; and when he propounds it to himselfe, to prove that Bishops and Presbyters are in Scripture the same, to let fall words that should confute his own proposition: whereas therefore *S. Ierome* saith, that after men began to say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos*, &c. it was decreed that one of the Presbyters should be set over the rest, &c. This is spoken indeed in the Apostles phrase, but not of the Apostles times, else to what purpose is that coacervation of texts that followes?

But suppose it should be granted to be of Apostolicall antiquity (which yet we grant not, having proved the contrary) yet it appeares: it was not of Apostolicall intention, but of Diabolicall occasion: And though the Divell by kindling Divisions in the Church, did minister Occasion to the invention of the primacy or prelacy or one for the suppressing of Schisme; yet there is just cause to thinke, that the Spirit of God in his Apostles was never the author of this Invention.

First, because we reade in the Apostles dayes there were Divisions, *Rom. 16. 7.* and Schismes, *1 Cor. 3. 3. & 11. 18.* yet the Apostle was not directed by the holy Ghost to ordaine Bishops for the taking away of those Divisions: Neither in the rules hee prescribes for the healing of those breaches, doth hee mention Bishops for that end: Nor in the Directions given to *Timothy* and *Ti-*

tus for the Ordination of Bishops or Elders, doth he mention this as one end of their Ordination, or one peculiar duty of their office. And though the Apostle saith, *Oportet hereses inter vos esse, ut qui probati sunt manifesti fiant inter vos*; yet the apostle no where saith, *Oportet Episcopos esse, ut tollantur hereses, quae manifesta fiunt*.

2. Secondly, because as Doctor Whitaker saith, the remedy devised hath proved worse then the disease, which doth never happen to that remedy whereof the holy Ghost is the author.

3. Thirdly, because the holy Ghost, who could foresee what would ensue thereupon, would never ordaine that for a remedy, which would not onely be ineffectuall to the cutting off of evill, but become a stirrup for Antichrist to get into his saddle. For if there be a necessity of setting up one Bishop over many presbyters for preventing schismes, there is as great a necessity of setting up one Archbishop over many Bishops, and one patriarch over many Archbishops, and one pope over all, unlesse men will imagine, that there is a danger of schisme only among presbyters, and not among Bishops and Archbishops, which is contrary to reason, truth, History, and our own Experience.

And lest our adversaries should appeale from Hierome as an incompetent Judge in this case, because a Presbyter, and so a party, we wil therefore subjoyne the judgements of other ancient Fathers who were themselves bishops.

The Commentaries that goe under the name of Saint Ambrose upon Ephes. 4. mention another occasion of this Discrimination or priority, and that was^a the increase and dilatation of the Church, upon occasion whereof they did ordaine rectors or Governours, and other officers in the Church; yet this he grants, that this did differ from the former orders of the Church, and from apostolicall Writ.

^a At ubi omnia Loca Circumplexa est Ecclesia, Conventicula constituta sunt: & ceperunt Rectores: & Ca.

tera Officia in Ecclesiis sunt ordinata. Caput aliorum ordine & Providentia gubernari Ecclesia. Ideo non per omnia conveniunt Scripta Apostoli ordinationi quae nunc in Ecclesia est, quia haec inter ista primordia scripta sunt. Nam & Timotheum à se Presbyterum Creatum Episcopum vocat, &c. Sed quia ceperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, &c.

And

And this Rectorship or Priority was devolved at first from one Elder to another by Succession, when hee who was in the place was removed, the next in order among the Elders Succeeded. But this was afterwards changed, and that unworthy men might not bee preferred, it was made a matter of election, and not a matter of Succession. Thus much we finde concerning the occasion of this imparity, enough to shew, it is not of Divine Authority.

For the second thing, the persons who brought in this Imparity, the same Authours tells us: the Presbyters themselves brought it in; witnesse *Hierome ad Evag. Hierom ad Alexandria Presbyteri unum ex se electum in Excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faceret, aut Diaconi de se Archidiaconum.* The Presbyters of *Alexandria* did call him their Bishop, whom they had chosen from among themselves, and placed in a higher degree, as if an army should make an Emperour, or the Deacons an Archdeacon.

Ambrose upon the fourth of the *Ephesians* tells us, it was done by a Councell, and although he neither name the Time nor place of the Councell, yet ascribing it to a Councell hee grants it not to be Apostolicall: this gave occasion to others to fixe it upon Custome as *Hieronym.* in *Tit.* and *August. Epist. 19. secundum honorum vocabula quae Ecclesia usus obtinuit Episcopatus Presbyterio major est.* And had that *Presbytie* or Prelacie had the Scale and confirmation of Divine or Apostolicall Authority, *Gregory Nazianzene* would never in such a Patheticke manner have wished the Abolition of it, as hee doth in his 28. *Oration.* *Ambros. ubi prius.* *Grego. Naz. Orat. 28.*

And now where is that acknowledgement, and conveyance of Imparity and Iurisdiction which saith this Remonstrant was derived from the Apostles hands, and deduced in an uninterrupted line, unto this day: where is it? we find no such Imparity delivered from Apostolicall hands, nor acknowledged in Apostolicall writings; yet had there beene such an acknowledgement and conveyance of imparity: how this should have
E beene

Greg. Nazi.
ubi prius.

beeine deduced to us in an uninterrupted Line, wee know not, unlesse our Bishops will draw the Line of their Pedigree through the loynes of Antichrist, and joyne issue, and mingle blood with Rome: which it seemes they will rather doe then lose this plea for their *venum sequela*: their tyrannicall prerogative, as Nazianzen calls it.

Pag. 22.

Suffer us therefore humbly to appeale to your Honours, whether this Remonstrant hath not given sentence against himselfe, who is so confident of the Evidence of his cause, that he doth not feare to say, if there can be better Evidence under Heaven for any matter of fact then there is for his Episcopacy: Let EPISCOPACY BE FOR EVER ABANDONED OUT OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.

SECT. VII.

Pag. 23.

YET it seemes himselfe in the height of his confidence was not without Jelousies, of some thing might be spoken against his Cause, therefore he seemes to heare, what is spoken against it.

That the Apostles Bishops and ours are twa: there was no other then a Parochiall Pastor, a Preaching Presbyter without inequality, without any Rule over his brethren. Ours claime an eminent Superiority, and a power of Ordination and Jurisdiction unknowne to the Primitive times.

Pag. 23.

That this which hee supposeth hee heares us say is Scripture Truth we have shewed already, &c. that there was a parity between Presbyters and Bishops: and that eminent superiority and power of Ordination and Jurisdiction which our Bishops claime, was unknowne to Scripture, and are now prepared by Gods assistance to prove, it was unknowne to primitive times.

Pag. 23.

But how doth this Remonstrant meete with this Reply: ALAS ALAS HOW GOOD PEOPLE may be abused by misinformation! It seemes the man Judged this Reply so poore as in his thoughts it was more worthy of his pity, then of his paines to answer, or rather knew there

there was more in this Reply, then hee knew how to answer, and therefore waves it with his *Rethoricke*.

And this we rather thinke, because hee knowes but little in *Antiquity*, that knowes not, that there is so vast a difference betweene our Bishops, and those that were not onely in the Apostles dayes (whom wee have proved to be undistinguished from Presbyters) But those Bishops that were in the Church 400 years after, when there began to bee some discrimination, that *Episcopacy* may well be likened to the Shippe *Argo*, that was so often repaired, as there was nothing left of the *First Materialls*; yet still it challenged the first Name.

Which difference we spread before your Honours in three particulars: first in point of Election to their office; secondly, in point of Execution of their office; thirdly, in point of State-Imployment.

First (having discovered already upon what occasion this priority began to have existence in the Church, and from whom it first received its being, not from God but from Consent and Custome of the Churches, according to *Ambrose, Ierom, Augustine, &c.*) Wee come now to Declare what was the manner of Election unto this Priority in these times, and to shew first, how therein these Bishops did differ from ours: for all their Elections were ordered by the privity, consent, and approbation of the people, where the Bishops was to serve. Were there no other Authours to make this good, *Cyprian* alone would doe it, among other places let his 68. Epistle witnesse, where he saith * *plebs Maxime habet potestatem, &c.* The people specially have power either of chusing worthy Priests, or rejecting the unworthy: for this is derived from *Divine Authority*, that the Priests should bee chosen in the presence of the people, before all their eyes and

*a Plebs ipsa
Maxime ha-
bet potestatem
vel Eligendi.
Dignos Sacer-
dotes, vel in-
dignos recu-*

sandi, quod & ipsum Videmus de Divina Autoritate descendere: ut sacerdos plebe presente sub omnium oculis deligatur, & dignus atque Idoneus publico Iudicio ac testimonio comprobetur. By Priests the Authour here understands Bishoppes, as the whole Series of the Epistle shewes.

1. approved as fit and worthy by their publike vote and Testimony. This hee proves by the Testimonie of Sacred writ both Old and New. Where wee observe first, that the speciall power of Judging of the worthinesse or unworthinesse of a man for the Prelacy was in the breast
2. of the People. Secondly, the speciall power of choosing or rejecting to his place according as they Judged him worthy or unworthy resided in the People. *Plebs maxime Habet potestatem, &c.* Thirdly, that this power did descend upon the People *De Divina Authoritate.*
- 3.

Nor was this the Judgement of one Sole man, but of an *Affrican* Synod consulted by the Spanish Churches in point of Election, as the inscription of the Epistle shewes.

α Κατὰ δὲ τὰς
ἐκκλησιαστικὰς
κανόνας, καὶ
κατὰ τὸ τῆς
ἐκκλησίας ῥῆμα,
πάντα κατὰ τὴν
ἐξουσίαν τῆς
καὶ προαχθῆναι,
παρεῖται τῇ
ἐκκλησίᾳ λαοῦ καὶ κληρικῶν,
ἀλλ' οὐδὲν βλαπτικὸν ἀναγκάζει.

The Obtrusion of a Bishop upon the Church of *Alexandria* without the Presence, desire and vote of the Clergie or People is Condemned by *Athanasius* not onely as a breach of Canon, but as a Transgression of Apostolicall prescript, and that it did compell or necessitate the heathen to blaspheme.

ἡτο δὲ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς καὶ τὰς πα-
λαιοὺς, τὰ δὲ ἴδια βλαπτικὴν ἀναγκάζει. *Athanas. Epist. ad Orthodoxos.*

Nor did onely *Christian Bishops*, but *Christian Princes* acknowledge the Right and power of Election of Bishops to be in the People; so that *admirable Constantine* the great Promover and Patron of the peace of the *Christian Church* writing to the Church of *Nicomedia* against *Eusebius* and *Theognis*, tells them the ready way to lay a sleepe the Tumults that did then disturb the Church about the Election of a Bishop was, *modo Episcopum fidelem & integrum nacti fuerint, quod quidem in praesentia in vestra situm est potestate, quodque etiam dudum penes vestrum Iudicium fuerat, nisi Eusebius de quo dixi pravo eorum, qui cum juverunt Consilio hac praeceptis ruiſſet & rectum Eligendi Ordinem impudenter conturbasset.* *Gelas in Act. Concil. Nicen. part. 3.* if they would get a faithfull and upright Bishop which

which saith he is in your power presently to doe; and was long agoe, if *Ensebins* with the ayd of his faction had not rushed in upon you, and impudently disturbed the right Order of Election.

That which this sacred Emperour calls the right order of Election; what is it but the Election by the people; in whose power, he saith, it then was and long had beene to choose a Bishop: and by whose power the next Bishop was chosen. So the same Author tells us, that after *Ensebins* and *Theognius* were cast out of their severall seats for *Arianisme*, by the Councell of *Nice*, others were appointed in their roomes by the Clergy and people of each Diocese.

Idem ubi supra.

To this Election in *Nicomedia*, wee could (if it were needfull in so cleare a Truth) adde many the like Presidents of popular Elections; which for brevities sake, we passe over. Not questioning, but that which hath beene spoken, is sufficient to informe the intelligent Reader, that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times, are Tvv o in point of Election.

Cyprian, Cornelius, Athanasius, and others.

SECT. VIII.

A Second thing wherein we have undertaken to shew, that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times, are Tvv o, is in the Execution of their Office: and here there are three things, wherein he that will not wilfully shut his eyes against all light, may see a Latitude of difference betweene ours and former Bishops. First, in that Sole Jurisdiction which our Bishops assume to themselves. Secondly, in the Delegation they make of the power of exercising this Jurisdiction unto others. Thirdly, in the way of the exercise of that power.

For the first of these, *Their sole Jurisdiction*; That our Bishops assume this to themselves, it is knowne and felt, and that this Sole Jurisdiction was a stranger, a Monster to former times, wee shall now prove, and make cleare, that the power of Ordination, Admonition, Excommunication,

Resolution, was not in the hands of any (sole man)

Cyp. Epist. 33.

Epist. 58.

apud Cyp.
Epist. 75.

Cum iure divi-
no non sint di-
versi gradus
Episcopi et Pa-
stores: Mani-
festum est or-
dinationem in
sua Ecclesia fa-
ctam PER
DIVINO
RATAM esse.
Itaque cum E-
piscopi ordina-
rii fiant hostes
Ecclesie aut
nolunt ordina-
tionem imperti-
re, Ecclesia re-
tinet sui su-
um. Melanch.
ubi supra, pag.
Concil. Antioch.
Can. 10. &
Ancyran. Can. 13.

First, for Ordination, Cyprian in his exile writing to his Charge, certifies them, that *Aurelius* was ordained by him and his Colleagues, who were present with him; who were these Colleagues, but his Presbyters? as he himselfe expounds it, writing to *Lucius* in his owne name, and the name of his Clergie and people, *Ego & Collega & fraternitas omnis, &c.* I and my Colleagues and my whole people send these Letters to you, &c. So that it is cleare in Cyprian's time, Presbyters had a hand in Ordination, and Bishops did not Ordaine alone. *Firmilianus* saith of them that rule in the Church, *Quod baptizandi, MANUM IMPONENDI ET ORDINANDI, possident potestatem.* And who those be, he expresseth a little before, *SENIORES & Prapostiti*: by whom the Presbyters as well as the Bishops are understood.

And as these places prove, that Bishops in the Primitive time, could not ordaine alone without the Presbyters, so there are that give us light to understand, that the Presbyters might ordaine without the Bishop. The Author of the Comment upon the *Ephesians*, that goes under the name of *Ambrose*, saith, *Apud Aegyptum Presbyteri consignant, si praesens non sit Episcopus.* In Egypt the Presbyters ordaine, if the Bishop be not present, so saith *Augustine* in the same words; and the *Chorepiscopus*, who was but a Presbyter, had power to impose hands, and to ordaine within his precincts, with the Bishops Licence. Now *Licences* conferre not a power to him that hath it not, but onely a facultie to exercise that power he hath.

The Iniquitie of our times hath beene such, that a Minister may not Preach to his owne flocke, without a Licence: doth this Licence make a man a Minister, and give him power to preach, or onely a facultie and libertie to exercise that power? Should a Bishop give a Laike a Licence to preach, or to ordaine, doth that Licence make him a Minister, or a Bishop? Sure all will say, no: why? because in the Laike there is not *Actus primus*, the roote and principle of that power, which Licence onely opens

a way

a way to the exercise of, and therefore that must be concluded to be in those Chorepiscopi, or Presbyters, by vertue of their place and calling, and not by vertue of a Licence. So that the power of Ordination was so farre from residing in the Bishop alone, as that the Presbyters and Chorepiscopi had power to ordaine as well as he.

Neither was this onely a matter of Ecclesiasticall Custome, but of Ecclesiasticall Constitution, which binds the Bishop;

First, in all his Ordinations to consult with his Clergy; *Concil. 4. Carthag. Can. 21.*
Ut Episcopus sine Consilio Clericorum suorum Clericos non ordinet; That the Bishop shall not ordaine a Clergy man without the counsel of the Clergy; this was Cyprians practice, Epist. 33.

Secondly, in his Ordinations to take the concurrent assistance of his Presbyters; *2. Ibid. Can. 3.*
Cum ordinatur Presbyter, Episcopo eum benedicente, & manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri qui presentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant; When a Presbyter is ordained, the Bishop blessing him, and holding his hand upon his head, all the Presbyters that are present, shall likewise lay their hands upon his head, with the hands of the Bishop. In which Canon, we have the unanimous vote of two hundred and fourteene Bishops, declaring that the power of Ordination is in the hands of Presbyters as well as Bishops.

And whereas it may be objected, that Hierome and Chrysostome, affirming Bishops to differ from Presbyters in the power of Ordination; seeme to imply, that that power is soly theirs: Here we desire it may be observed; *Hieronym. in Epist. ad Evag. Chrysost. Hom. 11. in 1 ad Tim.*

First, that these Fathers put all the difference that lyes betweene Bishops and Presbyters, to be in point of Ordination. *Quid facit Episcopus, quod non facit Presbyter excepta Ordinatione.* And therefore Chrysostome himselfe confesseth, that in his dayes there was little or no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter. *Inter Episcopum et Presbyterum interest ferme nihil, &c. Chrysost. upon the 1 Tim.*

Secondly, That this difference is not so to be understood, as if these Fathers did hold it to be by divine right (as Bellarmine and our Episcopall men would make us beleever) but by a humane constitution. And therefore they doe not speak *De jure*, but *de facto*, *Quid facit, &c.* not *quid debet facere*. And this Hierom confesseth. So Leo prim. ep. 88. upon complaints of unlawfulfull Ordinations, writing to the Germane and French Bishops,

Concil. Aquis-
gry. 1. Can. 8.
Solum propter
authoritatem
Clericorum or-
dinationis et con-
secrationis refer-
vata est sum-
mo Sacerdoti.

shops reckons up what things are reserved to the Bishops, Among which he set down *Presbyterium & Diaconorum consecratio*, and then adds, *Quae omnia sibi debentur summis Pontificibus Authoritate Canonum precipitur*: So that for this power of Ordination, they are more beholden to the Canon of the Church, then to the Canon of Gods Word.

Thirdly, we answer that this very humane difference was not in the Primitive Antiquity. It was not so in Cyprians time, as we even now shewed. And when it did prevail, it was but a particular custome (and sometimes usurpation) of some Churches. For it was otherwise appointed in the Councell of Carthage, and in Egypt, and other places, as is declared in the former part of this Section; And even in Chrysostomes time, it was so little approved of, that it was one great accusation against Chrysostome himselfe, That hee made Ordinations without the Presbytery, and without the consent of his Clergie. This is quoted by Bishop Downam, lib. 1. cap. 8. pag. 176.

SECT. IX.

NOR had the Bishop of former times more right to the power of sole Jurisdiction, then of sole Ordination: And here we have *Consistentem rem*, our very Adversaries confesse the Votes of Antiquity are with us.

Cyprian professeth, that hee would doe nothing without the Clergie; nay, he could doe nothing without them; nay, hee durst not take upon him alone to determine that which of right did belong to all: and had hee or any other done so, the fourth Councell of Carthage condemnes the Sentence of the Bishop, as *Irrita nisi Clericorum sententia confirmetur*.

Would yee know the particulars, wherein the Bishops had no power of Judicature without their Presbyters.

First, in judging and censuring Presbyters themselves, and their Doctrine; For this the Canon Law in Gratian is full and cleare: *Episcopus non potest Indicare Presbyterum vel Diaconum sine Synodo & Senioribus*: Thus Basill counselled and practised, epist. 75: So Ambr. lib. 10. epist. 80. Cyrill in epist. ad Iohannem Antiochen. Thus Gregory ad Iohan. Panormitan. lib. 11. epist. 49.

Secondly, in judging of the Conversation or Crimes of any of the members of the Church: *Penes Presbyteros est Disciplina qua facit homines meliores*; That Discipline that workes emendation in men, is in the power of the Elders.

Bilson. Spalat.
Franc. à Sancta
Clara.

Cyp. Epist. 6.
& 18.

18.
Concil. 4. Car-
thag. Can. 23.
Vid Ruff. Hist.
lib. 10. cap. 9.

Sozo. li. 2. c. 23.
Possidon. de vita
Aug. c. 4. Orig.
Hom. 11. in Exo.
pag. 97.

1
Decret. part. 2.
Can. 15. que. 7.
Per totum &
parte 1. Dist. 93.
cap. 5. 6.

2
Clem. Alex.
Stromat. lib. 7.

Elders. And therefore when any was questioned in point of conversation, hee was brought, saith *Tertullian*, into the Congregation where were *Exhortations, Castigations,* and *Divine censures*: And who had the chiefe stroke in these Censures, he tells us after: *President probati quique seniores*; All the approved Elders sit as Presidents.

And those censures that passed by the whole Presbytery were more approved by the Church in Ancient times, then such as were passed by one man; for wee finde that when *Syagrius* and *Ambrose* passed Sentence in the same case, the Church was unsatisfied in the Sentence of *Syagrius*, because he past it *sine alicujus fratris consilio*, without the counsell or consent of any of his Brethren. But were pacified with the sentence of Saint *Ambrose*: because, saith hee, *Hoc Judicium Nostrum cum fratribus & confacerdotibus participatum processerit*.

Not was there any kinde of censures that the Bishops did administer alone: Admonitions were given by the Elders; *Augustine* tells us the Elders did admonish such as were offenders; to the same purpose speaks *Origen* contra *Celsum*. Lib. 3.

^a So excommunication, though that being the dreadfullest thunder of the Church, and as *Tertullian* calls it, *summum prejudicium futuri Iudicii*, the great fore-runner of the Judgement of God, was never vibrated but by the hand of those that laboured in the Word and Doctrine: yet was no one man in the Church invested with this power more then another.

Therefore saith ^b *Hierom*; *Presbytero si peccavero licet me tradere satana in interitum carnis*. If I sinne, a Presbyter (not a Bishop onely) may deliver me to Satan, to the destruction, &c. where the Reader may please to take notice that Saint *Hierom* speaks not of one particular Presbyter, but of the Order of Presbyters.

The same S. *Hierom* saith againe, *Sunt quos Ecclesia reprehendit, quos interdum abijcit, in quos nonnunquam Episcoporum & Clericorum censura desavit*. There be some whom the Church reprooves, and some which shee casts out;

Tertull. Apo. advers. Gent.

Ambros. Epist. ad Syagrium.

Aug. de verb. Apost. Scr. 19.

a Constat, Iurisdictionem illam excommunicandi reos manifestorum criminum pertinere ad omnes Pastores, hanc ad se solos tyrannice transtulerunt, & ad questum contulerunt Episcopi, Melanc. ubi sup.

b Hieron. Epist. ad Heliodor.

Ep. ad Demet.

against whom the censures of *Bishops and Presbyters* sharply proceed; where we see, the Censures whereby wicked men were cast out of the Church, were not the sole hands of the Bishops, but likewise in the hands of Presbyters.

Syricius, Bishop of *Rome* signifies to the Church of *Millaine*, that *Iovinianus, Auxentius, &c.* were cast out of the Church for ever, and he sets downe how they did it, *Omnium Nostrum tam Presbyterorum quam Diaconorum, quam totius etiam cleri sciscitata fuit sententia.* There was a concurrence of all Presbyters, Deacons, and the whole Clergie in that sentence of Excommunication.

*Ambros. lib. 10
Epist. 80.*

*Cypr. Epist. 12.
And this was
the custome
saith Cyprian
in minoribus
delictis.*

The truth herein may be further evidenced by this, because the whole Clergie as well as the Bishops imposed hands upon such, as repenting were absolved: *Nec ad communicationem (saith Cyprian) venire quis possit, nisi prius ab Episcopo & Clero Manus illi fuerit imposita:* No man that hath beene excommunicated might returne to Church-Communion, before hands had been laid upon him by the Bishop and Clergie.

*Cypr. Epist. 46.
vide etiam Cypr
Epist. 6.*

Also writing to his Clergie concerning lapsed Christians, he tells them, *Exomologesi facta & manus eis a vobis in penitentiam imposita, &c.* that after confession and the laying on their hands, they might be commended unto God: so when certaine returning from their heresie were to be received into the Church at *Rome* in the time of *Cornelius*, they came before the *Presbyterie*, and therefore confessed their finnes, and so were admitted.

But though the sentence of Excommunication was managed onely by the hand of those that laboured in the Word and Doctrine, yet we will not conceale from you, that neither Excommunication nor absolution did passe without the knowledge and approbation of the body of the Church, to which the Delinquent did belong.

*Tertul. Apol.
adv. Gent.
cap. 39.*

So we have learned out of *Tertullian*, that their censures were ordered in their publike assemblies; and good reason, because the people were to forbear communion with such. *2 Thes. 3. 6, 14, 15.* and publick Centures of the

the Church were inflicted not onely for the Emendation of delinquents, but for the admonition of others, and therefore ought to be administred in publick that others might feare. 1 Tim. 5. 20. Origen speaking of the Duty and Power of the Church in cutting off a scandalous Person though a Presbyter: making the case his owne he saith thus: *In uno consensu Ecclesia universa conspirans excidat me dextram suam & projiciat a se*, He would have the consent of the whole Church in that Act. Origen. Hom. 7. in Josh.

And when the lapsed Christians were received againe into the Church, the Peoples consent was required therein; else why should Cyprian say, *Vix plebi persuadeo imò extorqueo ut tales patiantur admitti*: I can scarce persuade the people to suffer such to be admitted: and in another Epistle written to his people in his Banishment, he promiseth to examine all things, they being present and judging. *Examinabuntur singula presentibus & judicantibus vobis*. Cyprian. Epist. 55. Cyprian. Epist. 11. ad plebem.

But of this power of the People wee shall have a further occasion to speak afterwards, when we come to discourse of *Governing Elders*.

Onely may it please your Honours from hence to take notice, how unjustly our Bishops have invaded this right and power of Presbyters and people in Church censures, and devesting both of it, have girt it wholly upon themselves, and how herein they and the Bishops of former times are T W O.

S E C T. X.

ANd as our Bishops, and the Bishops of former times are T W O in point of *Sole Jurisdiction*, so also in the *Delegation* of this power of *Jurisdiction* unto others: to their Chancellours, Commissaries, Officers, &c. Was ever such a thing as this heard of in the best primitive Times? that men that never received *Imposition of hands*, should not onely be received into assistance, but be wholly intrusted with the power of *Spiritual Jurisdiction*: Even *Indecorum est Laicum vicari-um esse Episcopi, & seculares in Ecclesia judicare: in uno enim eodemque opere non decet dispar professio quod etiam in lege Divina prohibetur dicente Moyses, Non arabis in love & asino simul*, Concil. Hispan. 2.

then when it is to be exercised over such persons as have had hands laid upon them.

We may observe in *Cyprian*, whilst persecution separated him from his Church, when questions did arise among his people, he doth not send them to his Chancelour or Commissarie; No, he was so farre from substituting any man (much lesse a lay man) to determine or give Judgement in such cases, that hee would not assume that power wholly to himselfe, but suspends his Judgement, till the hand of God should restore him to his Church againe, that with the advice and Counsell of the Presbyters, he might give sentence: as may appeare to any that shall peruse his Epistles.

Sure if God had ever led his Church to such a way of deputation, it would have been in such a case of Necessity as this was: or had any footsteps of such a course as this beene visible by this holy Martyr in the goings of former ages, hee needed not have deferred the determination of the question about the receiving of some penitent lapsed ones into the bosome of the Church againe, till his returne and the returne of his Clergie, as he doth.

Cyp. Epist. 28.

We will instance in his 28 Epistle, wherein giving direction for the excommunicating of such as would rashly communicate with lapsed Christians, he gives this charge not to his Chancelour or Commissarie, or any other man upon whom he had devolved his power, and set him as his Deputie or Vicar generall in his absence, but *ad clerum*, to the whole Presbyterie.

Downam in the defence of his Sermon, lib. I. cap. 8.

This Truth is to cleare, that Bishop *Downam* the great Advocate of Episcopacie confesseth, that in *Ambrose* his time, & a good while after (which was about 400 yeers) till the Presbyters were in a manner wholly neglected, the Bishops had no Ordinaries, Vicars, Chancellors, or Commissaries, that were not Clergie men: but this is but a blind, wherewith the Bishop would worre his Reader, for wee challenge any man to produce the names of any Clergie man that was Vicar to *Ambrose*, or Chancelour to *Augustine*, or any other of the Bishops of these times;

so that herein our Bishops and theirs are Two.

SECT. XL

A Third branch wherein the difference betwene our Bishops, and the Bishops of former times, in point of Exercising their Jurisdiction, is visible, is the way or manner of exercising that power.

For brevities sake we will onely instance in their proceedings in Causes Criminall; where let them tell us, whether any good *Antiquity* can yeeld them one President for THEIR OATH EX OFFICIO, which hath been to their COURTS, as *Purgatory fire to the Popes Kitchen*: they have forgotten that old Maxime in the Civill Law, *Nemo tenetur prodere seipsum*, which as it is grounded upon naturall equity, so it is confirmed by a Law enacted by *Dioclesian* and *Maximilian*, *Nimis grave est quod petitis*, &c. It is too grievous that the adverse part should be required to the exhibition of such things as should create trouble to themselves. Understand therefore that you ought to bring proofes of your intentions, and not to extort them from your adversaries against themselves. Cod. l. 4. Tit. 20. L. 7.

Shall the Lamp of Nature in the night of Ethnicisme enable Heathen Princes, (yea Persecutors) to see and enact thus much, and shall not the glorious Sunne of the Gospel convince these of their iniquities in transgressing this Law, that call themselves the *Fathers of the Church*?

If neither the *light of Nature*, nor *Gospel light* can, yet the Custome of the Church, to which they so oft appeale, may both convince them of this iniquitie, and discover to all the world the contrarietie of their proceedings, to the proceedings of former times, in this particular.

For of Old, both the Plaintiffe and Defendant were brought face to face, before the parties, in whose power it was to judge: which way of proceeding, *Athanasius* affirms to be according to Scripture, the Law of God. And because those that condemned *Macarius*, did not Athanas. Apo. 1.

thus proceed, he condemnes their Sentence as malicious and unjust.

Of old, no Sentence passed against any man, but upon the Testimony of other witnesses besides the Accusers: after Complaint exhibited, the first thing they applyed themselves to, was to consider the person and qualitie of the Accuser, *Concil. prim. Constant. Can. 6.* Then they heard the Witnesses, who were two at least, *Can. Apost. Can. 75.* And these witnesses must be such, as might not be imagined to be partiall, nor to beare enmity nor malice against the party accused. *Ambros. Epist. 64.* so Gratian, *Caus. 3. qua. 5. cap. Quod suspecti.*

Of old, None might be party, witnesse, and Judge, which Gratian proves at large, *Caus. 4. qu. 4. cap. Nullus unquam praesumat accusator simul esse, & iudex & testis.*

We grant indeed the Canon Law permits in some cases Tryall without witnesses: *Si crimen ita publicum est, ut merito debeat appellari notorium*; If the crime be so publique, that it may deservedly be called Notorious. Which Law further determines what is notorious, saying, *Offensam illam nos intelligimus manifestam, quae vel per confessionem vel probationem legitime nota fuerit, aut evidentiâ Rei, quae nulla possit tergiversatione celari*; We count that offence manifest, which either by confession, or by lawfull prooffe comes to be knowne, or by evidence of fact, so as it can be hid by no tergiversations.

So that all was done in former times with mature deliberation, upon examination and evidence produced, and proved by such witnesses, as against whom the defendant could lay in no just exception. And not as now an accusation whispered against a man, he knows not by whom, to which he must take his Oath to answer, before he knows what his accusation is. Which Oath, if he takes, without further witness, he is censured upon the witness of his owne Oath. If he takes it not, he is sent presently to prison, there to lie without Bayle or Mainprize, till the insupportable miseries of his long durance, compel him to take an Oath against Nature, Scripture, Conscience, and the just Defence of his owne innocencie.

That

Apud Zont-
ram.

Greg. Decret.
lib. 3. Tit. 2.
cap. 8. quâ vobis.

Decret. Greg.
Lib. 5. Tit. 4.
cap. 24.

That our Bishops therefore and former Bishops are *Two*, in the point of executing their Judicatory power, we need spend no more time to prove. But come to the third thing, in which the difference betweene ours and former Bishops is to be evidenced.

SECT. XII.

AND that is State Employment, or attendance upon Civill and Secular affaires, &c. which both Christ and Saint Paul prohibits, which prohibition reacheth every Bishop (to speake in *Chrysostomes* words) as well as *Ti-mothy*, to whom it is directed; *Nullus ergo Episcopatu prae-ditus haec audire detrectet, sed agere ea omnia detrectet*; *Chrysof. Hom. 40. in Ti.* Let no man that is a Bishop, refuse to heare what the Apostle saith, but to doe what the Apostle forbids.

We deny not but that Bishops were in the Primitive times often incumbred with secular businesse; but these were put upon them, sometimes by Emperours, who sought the ruine of the Church, as *Julian*, of whom *Niceph. lib. 10. cap. 13.* doth report, that in *Clerum coaptatos Senatorum munere & ministerio perverse fungi iussit*. Sometimes the gracious disposition of Princes towards Christian Religion, made them thus to honour Bishops, thinking thereby to advance Religion; as *Constantine the Great* enacted, that such as were to be tryed before Civill Magistrates, might have leave to appeale *ad Iudicium Episcoporum, atque eorum sententiam ratam esse tanquam ab ipso Imperatore prolatam*: And this the Historian reckoneth as one argument of his reverend respect to Religion. Sometimes the excellency of their singular parts cast Civill dignities upon them. *Tiberius* granted a *Questors digni-tie* unto a Bishop for his eloquence, *Chrysostome* for his notable stoutnesse and freedome of speech, was sent as the fittest man to *Gainas*, with the Emperours command. Sometimes the people observing the Bishops to be much honoured by the Emperour, would sollicite them to present their grievances to the Emperour. And sometimes the

Recording
this among
those things
that hee did
*Dolo malo du-
cere.*

*xxviii. Nic.
Suzom. 1. 9.*

Niceph. 18. 5.

Socra. 7. 7.

Lib. 14. c. 14.

Soc. Li. 7. c. 19.

Niceph. L. 14.
cap. 14.

the aspiring humour of the Bishops raised them to such places, as appears by *Cyrill*, who was the first Bishop in *Alexandria*, who had civill dignities conferred upon him, as *Socrates* relates it, from whom Civill authority did descend upon succeeding Bishops. ἡ δὲ ἐκείνου ἐκείνου Ἀλεξανδρίας παρὰ τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῆς αὐτοκρατορίας τῶν πραγμάτων ἵσταται τῶν ἀρχῶν : of whom *Nicephorus* therefore recorded, *Episcopatum majoricum fastu, prophanorum Magistratum more, quam prædecessores ejus Episcopi, ingressus est, unde adeo initium sumptum est in Ecclesia Alexandrina ut Episcopi etiam profana negotia curarent*; He entered upon his Episcopacie with more pomp then his predecessors, with a pomp conformable to the Heathen Magistrates.

Both these *Historians* relate the sad consequence that followed upon this, that *Orestes* the Roman Governor seeing his power much weakned by the Bishops interposing in secular affaires, hated the Bishop; and this (as the *Historian* calls it) his *usurped power*.

This president of the Alexandrian Bishop, the Bishop of Rome did soone follow; *Et Romanus Episcopatus non aliter quam Alexandrinus, quasi EXTRA SACERDOTII FINES egressus ad secularem principatum erat jam delapsus*; The Bishop of Rome as well as the Bishop of Alexandria breaking the limits of the Priestly function, did degenerate into a secular Principalitie; which purchased no lesse envie to him then that to the other.

And though these two Bishops went at first abreast in this point, yet in a short time the Roman had outstripped the Alexandrian in that power, till the Church degenerating more and more, that Roman Priest advanced his power not onely above all the Bishops, but all the Monarchs in the Christian Orbe.

Yet notwithstanding, he that shall look into the Ancients, shall finde; first, that the best of them held, that they were not to be molested with the handling of worldly affaires, *Cyprian Epist. 66. 1. Singuli divino Sacerdotio honorati non nisi altari & sacrificiis deservire & precibus atq;*
oratio-

orationibus vacare debent, Molestiis secularibus non sunt obligandi, qui divinis rebus & spiritualibus occupantur.

Secondly, that they complained of them as of heavy burthens, *Aug.* calles it *Angaria*, yea *Austin* himselfe in his 81. Epistle Complaines, that worldly businesse hindered his praying, and so pressed him, that *vix respirare potuit*: and *Gregory the great* *non sine dolore in secularibus versabatur*, *prefat. in Dial.*

*Possidon. in
vita August.*

Thirdly, *Cyprian* construed it as one great cause of persecutions raised against the Church, *de lapsis, Sect. 4.*

Fourthly, it was much cryed downe as unlawfull by the holy Fathers, many Canons forbidding it, and that under paine of being removed from their places. *Can. Apost. Can. 6. Can. 81.* hee that did presume to administer *Ποικίλῳ ἀρχὴν καὶ ἰσχυρὴν διοίκειν*, to a Roman command or Administration of Military affaires or civill place (as *Zonaras* there) he should be deposed, *Can. Apo. Can. 83.* hiring of ground, meddling with worldly affaires is to be laid asid by them: Otherwise they are threatned to be liable to Ecclesiasticall censures, *Conc. Cal. Cano. 3. Conc. Carth. Can. 16.*

We will ad this for a conclusion in this point, it is observed by *Athanasius*, *Sulpitius*, *Severus*, and other Ecclesiasticall Historians, that the *Arians* were very expedite in worldly affaires, which experience they gained by their constant following and attendance upon the Emperours Court; and what troubles they occasioned to the Church thereby, is notoriously knowne to any that have scene the Histories of their times. And in this our Bishops have approved themselves more like to the *Arian* Bishops then the purer Bishops of purer times: but how ever cleare it is, that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times are Two: Two in election to their office; Two in the discharge of their office; Two in their Ordination, Jurisdiction, processes, Censures, Administrations, and the difference betweene our Bishops and those of former times, is greater then between the great Bishop of Rome and them.

BUt it seemes our Remonstrant soared above those times even as high as the Apostles dayes, for so hee saith, *If our Bishops challenge any other spirituall power, then was by Apostolike Authority delegated to, and required of Timothy and Titus, and the Angels of the seven Asian Churches, let them be DISCLAIMED as USURPERS.* And the truth is, so they deserve to be, if they do but challenge the same power that the Apostle did delegate to Timothy and Titus; for Timothy and Titus were Evangelists, and so moved in a Sphere above Bishops or Presbyters. For Timothy, it is cleare from the letter of the Text, *2 Tim. 4. 5. ἐργον ποιησον ἐυαγγελιστοῦ: Doe the worke of an Evangelist:* if Timothy had beene but a Presbyter or Bishop, Paul had here put him upon imployment, *Ultra-Spherā Activitatis.*

^a Let the Reader please to consult Euseb. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 33 according to some, after others. cap. 37. and view the description, he there makes of an Evangelist, and then judge of what wee speake.

And to any man, that will but understand and consider what the Office of an ^a Evangelist was, and wherein it differed from the Office of a Presbyter or Bishop, it will bee manifest that Timothy and Titus were Evangelists, and no Bishops: for the title of Evangelist is taken but two wayes; either for such as wrote the Gospel, and so wee doe not as firme Timothy and Titus to bee Evangelists: or else for such as taught the Gospel; and those were of two sorts, either such as had ordinary places and ordinary gifts, or such whose places and gifts were extraordinary; and such Evangelists were Timothy and Titus; and not Bishops, as will appeare if wee consider, what was the Difference betweene the Evangelists and Bishops. Bishops or Presbyters were tyed to the particular care and tuition of that flock over which God had made them Overseers, Acts 20. 28. But Evangelists were not tyed to reside in one particular place, but did attend upon the Apostles by whose appoyntment they were sent from place to place, as the necessity of the Churches did require. As appeares first in Timothy whom S. Paul besought to abide at Ephesus. 1 Tim. 1. 3. which had been a needlesse importunity, if Timothy had had the Episcopall (that is the Pastorall) charge of Ephe-

Ephesus committed to him by the Apostles, for then hee might have laid as dreadfull a Charge upon him to abide at *Ephesus*, as he doth to Preach the Gospell. But so far was *Paul* from setting *Timothy* in *Cathedra* in *Ephesus*, that he rather continually sends him up and downe upon all Church services, for we finde *Acts*. 17. 14. That when *Paul* fled from the tumults of *Berea* to *Athens*, he left *Silas* and *Timothy* behinde him, who afterwards comming to *Anno, Aera*
Paul to *Athens*, *Paul* sends *Timothy* from *Athens* to *Thes-* *Christi re-*
salonica, to confirme the *Thessalonians* in the faith, as ap- *cepta*, 47.
 peares 1 *Thes*. 3. 1. 2. from whence returning to *Paul* to
Athens againe, the Apostle *Paul* before hee left *Athens*
 and went to *Corinth*, sent him & *Silas* into *Macedonia*, who
 returned to him againe to *Corinth*, *Act*. 18. 5. afterwards *Anno 48.*
 they travelled to *Ephesus*, from whence we read *Paul* sent
Timothy and *Erastus* into *Macedonia*, *Act*. 19. 22. whither *Anno 51.*
Paul went after them, & from whence they & divers other
Brethren journied into *Asia*, *Acts* 20. 4. All which *Bre-* *Anno. 53.*
thren *Paul* calles, as it is probable, *Ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν*, the
 messengers of the Churches, 2 *Cor*. 8. 23. And being thus
 accompanied with *Timothy*, and the rest of the *Brethren* he
 comes to *Miletum*, and calls the *Elders* of the Church of *Anno 53.*
Ephesus, thither to him, of which Church had *Timothy*
 beene *Bishop*, the Apostle in stead of giving the *Elders* a
 charge to feede the flock of *Christ*, would have given that
 charge to *Timothy*, and not to them.

And secondly, the Apostle would not so have forgotten himselfe, as to call the *Elders* *Ἐπισκοποι*, before their *Bishops* face.

Thirdly, It is to be conceived, the Apostles would have given them some directions, how to carry themselves towards their *Bishop*, but not a word of this, though *Timothy* were then in *Pauls* presence, and in the presence of the *Elders*. The cleare evidence of which text demonstrates, that *Paul* did not leave *Timothy* at this time as *Bishop* of *Ephesus*. But it is rather evident that hee tooke him along with him in his journey to *Hierusalem*, and so to *Rome*; for wee finde that those *Epistles* *Paul* wrote while

hee was a prisoner, beare either in their inscription or some other passage of them, the name of *Timothy*, as *Pauls* companion, viz. The Epistle to the *Philippians*, *Colossians*, *Hebrewes*, *Philemon*, which Epistles he wrote in bonds as the contexture, which those two learned professors, the one at *Heydelberge*, the other at *Saulmur*, make of *Saint Pauls* Epistles, doth declare.

Parvus.
Capellus.

Heb. 13. 23.
Wee finde not only that *Timothy* was with *Paul* at *Rome*, but a Prisoner with him there.

So that it appeares that *Timothy* was no *Bishop*, but a *Minister*, an *Evangelist*, a fellow labourer of the Apostles, *1 Thess. 3. 1.* an *Apostle*, a *Messenger* of the Church, *2 Cor. 8. 3.* a *Minister of God*, *1 Thess. 3. 2.* these titles the Holy Ghost gives him, but never the title of a *Bishop*.

^a *Anno 43.*

^b *Anno. 45.*

^c *Anno 46.*

The like we find in Scripture concerning *Titus*, whom *Paul* as it is conceived by learned men, did first assume into the fellowship of his Labours in the place of *Iohn*, and made him his companion in his journey through *Antioch* to *Hierusalem*,^b so we find *Gal. 2. 1.* from thence returning to *Antioch* againe; from thence hee passed through *Syria* and *Cilicia*, confirming the Churches, & from *Cilicia*, he passed to *Crete*, where having Preached the Gospell, and planted Churches, he left *Titus*^c there for a while, to set in order things that remaine.

^d *Anno 51.*

^e *Anno 51.*

^f *Anno 52.*

Yet it was but for a while he left him there, for in his Epistle which he wrote to him not many yeares after, hee injoyne him to come to him to *Nicopolis*^d where he did intend to winter, but changing that purpose sends for him to *Ephesus*, where it seemes his Hyemall station was, and from thence sends him before him to *Corinth*, to enquire the state of the *Corinthians*^e. His returne from thence *Paul* expects at *Troas*^f, and because comming thither he found not his expectation there, he was so grieved in his spirit, *2 Cor. 2. 12.* that hee passed presently from thence into *Macedonia*, where *Titus* met him; and in the midst of his afflictions joyed his spirits with the glad tydings of the powerfull and gracious effects, his first Epistle had among the *Corinthians*, *2 Cor. 7. 5, 6, 7.* *Paul* having there collected the Liberalities of the Saints, sends *Titus* againe

again to the *Corinthians*, to prepare them for the same *Anno 53.*
 service of Ministering to the necessities of the Saints, *2 Cor.*
8.6. And makes him with some others the Conveyers of
 that second Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

All these journeyes to and fro did *Titus* make at the de-
 signement of the *Apostle*, even after hee was left in *Crete*.
 Nor doe we finde, that after his first removall from *Crete*, *Anno 64.*
 he did ever returne thither. Wee read indeed, *2 Tim. 4.*
10. hee was with *Paul* at *Rome*; and from thence returned
 not to *Crete*, but into *Dalmatia*. All which doth more
 then probably shew, it never was the Intendment of the
Apostle to fix *Titus* in *Crete* as a *Bishop*, but onely to leave
 him there for a season for the good of that Church, and
 to call him from thence, and send him abroad to other
 Churches for their good, as their necessities might re-
 quire. Now who that will acknowledge a Distinction be-
 tweene the Offices of *Bishops* and *Evangelists*, and knowes
 wherein that Distinction lyes, will not upon these premis-
 ses conclude that, *Timothy* and *Titus* were *Evangelists* and
 NOT *Bishops*.

I but some of the *Fathers* have called *Timothy* and *Ti-
 tus* *Bishops*. We grant it true; and it is as true, that some
 of the *Fathers* have called them *Archbishops*, and *Patri-
 archs*; yet it doth not follow, they were so. Wee adde,
 secondly, that when the *Fathers* did call them so, it
 was not in a proper but in an improper sense; which
 we expresse in the words of our *Learned Orthodox Ray-
 nolds*;

You may learne by the *Fathers* themselves, saith hee, *Raynolds contra*
 that when they tearmed any *Apostle* a *Bishop* of thi or *Hart. Ca. 6.*
 that City (as namely *Saint Peter* of *Antioch* or *Rome*)
 they meant it in a generall sort and signification, because
 they did attend that Church for a time, and supply that
 roome in preaching the *Gospel*, which *Bishops* did after;
 but as the name of *Bishop* is commonly taken for the O-
 verseer of a particular Church, and *Pastor* of a severall
 flocke; so *Peter* was not *Bishop* of any one place; there-
 fore not of *Rome*. And this is true by *Analogy* of all extra-

ordinary Bishops, and the same may be said of *Timothy* and *Titus*, that he saith of *Peter*.

Pag. 23. But were it true that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops; will this remonstrant undertake, that all his party shall stand to his Conditions? If our Bishops challenge any other power then was by *Apostolique* Authority delegated to, and required of *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the *Angells* of the seven *Asian Churches*, let them be disclaimed as usurpers. Will our Bishops indeed stand to this? then *actum est*. Did ever *Apostolique* authority delegate power to *Timothy* or *Titus*, to ordaine alone? to governe alone? and doe not our Bishops challenge that power? Did ever *Apostolique* authority delegate power to *Timothy* and *Titus*, to rebuke an *Elder*? no; but to entreate him as a *Father*: and doe not our Bishops challenge to themselves, and permit to their *Chancellours*, *Commissaries*, and *Officialls* power not only to rebuke an *Elder*, but to rayle upon an *Elder*? to reproach him with the most opprobrious tearmes of *foole*, *knave*, *jack-sauce*, &c. which our paper blushes to present to your *Honours* view. Did ever *Apostolique* authority delegate to *Timothy* and *Titus* power to receive an accusation against an *Elder*, but before two or three witnesses? and doe not our Bishops challenge power to proceed *Ex officio*, and make *Elders* their owne Accusers? Did ever *Apostolique* authority delegate power to *Timothy* or *Titus*, to reject any after twice admonition, but an *Heretick*? and doe not our Bishops challenge power to reject and eject the most sound and orthodox of our *Ministers*, for refusing the use of a *Ceremony*; as if *Non-conformity* were *Heresie*. So that either our Bishops must disclaime this remonstrance, or else themselves must be disclaimed as usurpers.

But if *Timothy* and *Titus* were no Bishops, or had not this power, it may bee the *Angells* of the seven *Asian Churches* had; and our *Remonstrant* is so subtile as to twist these two together, that if one fayle, the other may hold.

To which we answer; first, that *Angell* in those *Epistles* is put *Collectively*, not *Individually*; as appears by the *Epistle* to *Thyatira*, cap. 2. vers. 24. where wee reade

reade *οἱ μὲν δὲ λέγουσιν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς*, &c. But I say unto *you* (in the plurall number, not unto *thee* in the singular) and unto the rest in *Thyatira*, &c. Here is a plaine distinction betweene the members of that Church. By *you*, is signified those to whom hee spake under the name of the Angell. By *the rest*, the residue of the people. The people governed, and the governours in the plurall number. What can be more evident to prove, that by *Angell* is meant not one singular person, but the whole company of Presbyters that were in *Thyatira*.

This also further appeares, because it is usuall with the holy Ghost, not only in other books of the Scripture, but also in this very booke of the *Revelation*, to expresse a company under one singular person. Thus the Civill state of *Rome*, as opposite to Christ, is called, *A beast with ten hornes*: and the Ecclesiasticall state Antichristian is called *the whore of Babylon*, and, *the false Prophet*: and the devill and all his family is called *An old red Dragon*. Thus also the seven Angels that blew the seven trumpets, *Revel. 8. 2.* And the seven Angels that poured out the seven Vials, are not literally to be taken, but Synecdochically, as all know. And why not then the seven Angels in those Epistles? Master *Meede* in his Commentaries upon the *Revelation*, pag. 265, hath these words; *Denique (ut jam semel iterumque monuimus) quoniam Deus adhibet angelos providentiae suae in rerum humanarum moribus & conversionibus ciendis, gubernandisque ministros: idcirco, quae multorum manibus peraguntur, Angelo tamen tanquam rei gerende praesidi & Duci pro communi loquendi modo tribuuntur.*

Adde, thirdly, that the very name *Angell* is sufficient to prove, that it is not meant of one person alone, because the word *Angell* doth not import any peculiar jurisdiction or preheminance, but is a common name to all Ministers, and is so used in Scripture. For all Ministers are Gods Messengers and Embassadors, sent for the good of the Elect. And therefore the name being common to all Ministers, why should wee thinke that there should be any

any thing spoken to one Minister, that doth not belong to all? The like argument wee draw from the word *Starres*, used Revel. 1. 20. *The seven Starres are the Angels of the seven Churches.* Now it is evident, that all faithfull Ministers are called *Starres* in Scripture, whose duty is to shine as lights unto the Churches, in all purity of doctrine and holinesse of conversation. And in this sence, the word is used, when it is said, that *the third part of the starres were darkened*, Revel. 8. 12. and that the *Dragons taile drew the third part of the starres of Heaven, & cast them to the Earth*, Revel. 12. 4. Which is meant not onely of Bishops, but of other Ministers, unlesse the Bishops will appropriate all corruption and Apostacy unto themselves.

Adde, fourthly, out of the Text it selfe, It is very observable, that our Saviour in opening the mystery of the Vision, Revel. 1. 20. saith; *The seven Candlestickes which thou sawest, are the seven Churches*, but hee doth not say. *The seven starres are the seven Angels of the same Churches*, But *the Angels of the seven Churches*; wherein not without some mystery the number of the Angels is omitted, least we should understand by Angell, one Minister alone, and not a company. And yet the septenary number of Churches is twice set down.

Lastly, though but one Angell bee mentioned in the forefront, yet it is evident, that the Epistles themselves are dedicated to all the Angels and Ministers in every Church, and to the Churches themselves. And if to the whole Church, much more to the Presbyters of that Church. This is proved Revel. 1. 11. *What thou seest write in a Book, and send it to the seven Churches which are in Asia.* And also by the Epiphonema of every Epistle; *He that hath an eare to heare, let him heare what the Spirit saith to the Churches.* Upon which words, *Ambrosius Ansbertus* in his second booke upon the Revelation, saith thus; *Unâ eademque locutione & Angelos & Ecclesias unum esse designat. Nam cum in principio locutionis quæ ad septem sunt Angelos dicat, & Angelo illius Ecclesia scribe; in fine tamen eandem*

non dicit, qui habet aurem audiat quod spiritus dicat Angelo, sed quid Ecclesie dicat. By one and the same phrase of speech hee sheweth, the Angels and the Churches to bee one and the same. For whereas in the beginning of his speech, which he makes to the seven Churches, he saith; *And write to the Angell of the Churches;* yet in the close of the same, he doth not say, Hee that hath an Eare, let him heare what the Spirit saith to the Angel, but *what he saith to the Church.* And this is further proved by the whole argument of those Epistles, wherein the admonitions, threatnings, commendations, and reproofes, are directed to all the Ministers of all the Churches. *Revel. 2. 10. The devill shall cast some of you into prison, &c. Rev. 2. 16. I will fight against them with the sword of my mouth, Rev. 2. 24. I will put upon you no other burden, &c. I say unto you and the rest of Thyatira, as many as have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan, &c. And when it is said in the singular Number (as it is often) I know thy works and thy labour, &c. vers. 2. & vers. 4. Repent and doe thy first works; and verse 13. Thou hast not denied my Faith, &c. and cap. 3. 26. Because thou art neither hot nor cold, &c.* All these and the like places, are not to bee understood as meant of one individuall person, but of the whole company of Ministers, and also of the whole Church, because that the punishment threatned, is to the whole Church; *Revel. 2. 5. Repent and doe thy first works, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and remove thy Candlestick out of his place; Rev. 2. 16. Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth; Revel. 2. 24. I will not put upon you any other burden.* Now wee have no warrant in the Word to thinke that Christ would remove his Gospell from a Church for the sinne of one Bishop, when all the other Ministers and the Churches themselves are free from those sinnes. And if God should take this course, in what wofull and miserable condition should the Church of England be, which groaneth under so many corrupt Prelates? By all this it appeares, that the word *angell*, is not to be taken, *ἄγγελος*; but *ἐκκλησία*,

not properly, but figuratively. And this is the judgement of Master Perkins upon the second Chapter of the *Revelation*; and of Master Brightman; and of Doctor Fulke, who in answer to the Rhemists in *Apoc.* 1. 20. hath these words; S. Iohn by the angels of the Churches meaneth not all, that should weare on their heads myters, and hold crozier staves in their hands, like dead Idolls, but them that are the faithfull messengers of Gods Word, and utter and declare the same. Againe, they are called the angels of the Churches, because they be Gods messengers.

Master Fox likewise in his Meditation upon the *Revelation* (pag. 7. 9. 17.) is of this opinion, and hath gathered to our hands the opinions of all Interpreters hee could meete, and saith that they all consent in this, that under the person of an Angell, the Pastors and Ministers of the Churches were understood. Saint Austin in his 132. Epistle, saith thus; *Sic enim in Apocalypsi legitur Angelus, &c. Quod si de angelo superiorū cælorum, & non de Præpositis ecclesiarum vellet intelligi, non consequenter diceret, habeo adversum te, &c.* And so in his second Homily upon the *Revelation* (if that booke be his) *Quod autem dicit angelo Thyatira, habeo adversum te pauca, dicit Præpositis Ecclesiarum, &c.* This also Gregory the Great, lib. 34. *Moral.* in Job cap. 4. *Sapè sacram scripturam predicatorum Ecclesia, pro eo quod patris gloriam annunciant, angelorum nomine solere designare: & hinc esse, quod Iohannes in Apocalypsi septem Ecclesiis scribens, angelis Ecclesiarum loquitur, id est, Prædicatoribus populorum.* Master Fox citeth Primasius, Haymo, Beda, Richard, Thomas, and others, to whom we referre you.

If it be here demanded (as it is much by the Hierarchicall side) that if by angell bee meant the whole company of Presbyters, why Christ did not say, to the angels in the plurall number, but to the angell in the singular?

Wee answer, that though this question may favour of a little too much curiosity, yet wee will make bold to subjoyn three conjecturall reasons of this phrase of speech.

First,

First, It is so used in this place, because it is the common language of other Scriptures in types and visions to set down a certaine number for an uncertaine, and the singular number for the purall. Thus the Ramme, *Dan. 8.3.* is interpreted verſ. 20. to be the Kings of Media and Persia. And the enemies of Gods Church are set out by foure hornes. And the deliverers by foure Carpenters, *Zach. 1. 18. 20.* And the wise and foolish Virgins are said to be five wise and five foolish. And many such like. And therefore as we answer the Papists, when they demand why Christ if he meant figuratively when he saith, *this is my body*, did not speake in plaine language, *this is the signe of my body*? We say, that this phraſe of speech is proper to all Sacraments: So we also answer here, this phraſe of speech, *angell* for *Angels*, is common to all types and visions.

Secondly, angell is put, though more be meant, that so it may hold proportion with the Vision which *Iohn* saw, *Chap. 1. 12. 20.* He saw seven golden Candlestickes, and seven Starres. And therefore to hold proportion, the Epistles are directed to seven angels, and to seven Churches. And this is called a mystery, *Revel. 1. 20.* The mystery of the seven Starres, &c. Now a mystery is a secret, which comprehends more then is expresseſſed; and therefore though but one angell be expresseſſed, yet the mystery implies all the angels of that Church.

Thirdly, to signifie their unity in the Ministeriall function, and joynt commiſſion to attend upon the feeding and governing of one Church, with one common care, as it were with one hand and heart. And this is more fitly declared by the name of one angell, then of many. Wee often finde the name of (one) Prophet or Priest to be put for the generall body of the Ministry, or whole multitude of Prophets, or Priests, in the Church of *Israel* or *Judah*, when the Spirit of God intendeth to reprove, threaten, or admoniſh them. Thus it is *Iere. 6. 13. 18. 18. Isa. 3. 2. Hoſ. 9. 8. Ezek. 7. 26. Hoſ. 4. 6. Mal. 2. 7.* Neither should it seeme strange, that a multitude or

company of Ministers should bee understood under the name of one angell, seeing a multitude of Heavenly angels (implied in one service for the good of Gods Saints) is sometimes in the Scripture shut up under one angell in the singular number, as may be gathered from *Gen. 24. 7. 2 Kings 19. 35. Psal. 34. 7.* compared with *Psalm 91. 11. Gen. 32. 1. 2. Kings 6. 16, 17.* And also a multitude of devils or evill angels, joyntly labouring in any one worke, is set forth under the name of one evill or uncleane spirit, *1 Kings 22. 21, 22. Mark. 1. 23, 24. Mark. 5. 2. 9. Luke 4. 53, 34. Luk. 8. 27. 30. 1 Pet. 5. 8. Heb. 2. 14. Ephes. 6. 11. 12.*

But now let us suppose (which yet notwithstanding we will not grant) that the word *Angell* is taken individually for one particular person, as Doctor *Reynolds* seemes to interpret it, together with Master *Beza*, yet nevertheless, there will nothing follow out of this acception, that will any wayes make for the upholding of a Diocesan Bishop, with sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, as a distinct superior to Presbyters. And this appeares.

First, because it never was yet proved nor ever will (as we conceive) that these angels were Diocesan Bishops, considering that Parishes were not divided into Diocesses in *S. Iohns* dayes. And the seven starres are said to bee fixed in their seven Candlestickes, or Churches, not one starre over divers Candlestickes. Neither can those Churches be thought to be Diocesan, when not only *Tindall* and the old translation, calls them seven Congregations, but we reade also *Acts 20.* that at *Ephesus* which was one of those Candlestickes, there was but one flock.

And secondly, we further finde that in *Ephesus* one of those seven Churches, there were many Presbyters, which are all called Bishops, *Acts 20. 28.* and we finde no colour of any superintendency or superiority of one Bishop over another. To them in generall the Church is committed to be fed by them without any respect had to *Timothy*, who stood at his elbow and had beene with him in Macedonia, and was now waiting upon him to *Ierusalem*.

lem. This is also confirmed by *Epiphanius*, who writing of the Heresies of the *Melians*, saith, that in ancient times this was peculiar to *Alexandria*, that it had but one bishop, whereas other Cities had two. And hee being bishop of Cypres, might well be acquainted with the condition of the Churches of *Asia*, which were so nigh unto him.

Thirdly, there is nothing said in the seven Epistles that implyeth any superiority or majority of rule or power that these angels had over the other angels that were joyned with them in their Churches. It is written indeed, in commendation of the angell of the Church of *Ephesus*, that he could not beare them that were evill, and that he had tryed them which say they were Apostles and are not, & had found them lyars. And it is spoken in dispraise of the angell of *Pergamus*, that he suffered them which held the doctrine of *Balaam*, &c. But these things are common duties, requirable at the hands of all Ministers, who have the Charge of Soules.

But suppose that there were some superiority and prehemineny insinuated by this individuall angell, yet who knoweth not that there are divers kinds of superiority; to wit, of Order, of dignity, of gifts and parts, or in degree of Ministry, or in charge of power and jurisdiction. And how will it be proved that this angell if he had a superiority, had any more then a superiority of order, or of gifts and parts? Where is it said, that this angell was a superior degree or order of Ministry above Presbyters? In which Epistle it is said that this angell had sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction? and therefore as our learned Protestants prove against the Papists, that when Christ directed his speech to *Peter* in particular and said, *I will give unto thee the keyes of the kingdom of Heaven, &c.* That this particularization of *Peter* did not import any singular prehemineny or majority of power to *Peter* more then to the other apostles. But that though the promise was made to *Peter*, yet it was made to him in the name of all the rest, and given to all as well as one. And

Hoc erant uti-
que & ceteri
apostoli quod
fuerat Petrus,
pari consortio
pediti & hono-
ris & potesta-
tis, sed exordium
ab unitate pro-
ficiscitur, ut Ec-
clesia una mon-
straretur.

that therefore it was spoken to one person, and not to all, that so Christ might fore signifie the unity of his Church, as *Cyprian, Austin, Hierome, Optatus*, and others say. So when Christ directs an Epistle to one angell, it doth not imply a superior power over his fellow angels, but at most onely a presidency for order sake. And that which is written to him, is written to the rest as well as to him. And therefore written to one, not to exclude the rest, but to denote the unity that ought to bee betweene the Ministers of the same Church in their common care and diligence to their flocke. And this is all that Doctor *Reynolds* saith, as you may reade in his conference with *Hart*, cap. 4. divis. 3. ad finem. For it is evident that Doctor *Reynolds* was an utter enemy to the *Ius Divinum* of the Episcopall preheminency over Presbyters by his Letter to Sir *Francis Knolls*. And learned Master *Beza* also saith something to the same purpose in his annotations upon *Revel. 2. 1. Angelo. i.* *quod nimirum oportuit imprimis de his rebus admoneri, ac per eum ceteros collegas, totamq; adeo Ecclesiam. Sed hinc statui Episcopalis ille gradus postea humanitus in Ecclesiam Dei inuectus certe nec potest nec debet, imo ne perpetuum quidem istud proprium munus esse necessario oportuisse, sicut exorta inde Tyrannis oligarchica (cujus apex est Antichristiana bestia) certissima cum totius non Ecclesia modo, sed etiam orbis perniciem, nunc tandem declarat.*

If therefore our Remonstrant can produce no better evidence for his Hierarchy then *Timothy*, and *Titus*, and the Angels of the Asian Churches, Let not this Remonstrant and his party, cry out of wrong, if this claimed Hierarchy be for ever booted out of the Church, seeing it is his owne Option. And yet we cannot conceale one refuge more out of Scripture, to which the Hierarchy betake themselves for shelter. And that is the two Postscripts in the end of *Pauls* second Epistle to *Timothy*, and of that to *Titus*; where in the one, *Timothy* is said to be the first bishop of *Ephesus*, and in the other, *Titus* is said to be the first Bishop of the Church of the *Cretians*: to both which places wee answer,

That

That these two Postscripts (and so all the rest) are no part of Canonickall Scripture. And therefore our former and ancients English translations, though they have these Postscripts, yet they are put in a small character different from that of the text, that all men might take notice they were no parts of the text. Although our Episcopall men of late in newer impressions have enlarged their Phylacteries, in putting those Postscripts in the same full character with that of the text, that the simple might beleeve they are Canonickall Scripture. The Papists themselves (*Baronius, Serrarius*, and the Rhemists) confesse that there is much falsity in them. The first Epistle to *Timothy*, is thus subscribed: *the first to Timothy was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefest City of Phrygia Pacatiana*. Here we demand, whether *Paul* when he writ the first Epistle to *Timothy*, was assured he should live to write a second, which was written long after? And if not; How comes it to be subscribed, *the first to Timothy*, which hath relation to a second? Besides, the Epistle is said to be writ from *Laodicea*, whereas *Beza* in his Annotations proves apparently, that it was written from *Macedonia*; to which opinion *Baronius* and *Serrarius* subscribe. It is added, *which is the chiefest City of Phrygia Pacatiana*. But this Epithete is no where read in the Writers of those ages, saith *Beza*, *Sed apud recentiores illos, qui Romani imperii jam inclinantis provincias descriperunt*. So that by this place it is evident, that the subscription was added a long while after the writing of the Epistles by some men, for the most part *vel indoctis*, saith *Beza*, *vel certe non satis attentis*, Either by a learned, or negligent man.

The second Epistle is thus subscribed; *the second Epistle unto Timothy ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesiāns, was written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the second time*. Now these words *Ordained the first Bishop*, is wanting, saith *Beza*, *in quibusdam vetustis codicibus, in veteri vulgata editione, & apud Syrum interpretem*. If *Saint Paul* had written this Postscript, he would

would not have said, to *Timothy* the first Bishop, &c. whereas it was not yet certaine whether ever there should be a second. Neither would it bee said when *Paul* was brought, &c. But when I was the second time brought before *Nero*. The Syriack Interpreter reads it, *Here ends the second epistle to Timothy written from Rome.*

The Epistle to *Titus* is thus subscribed: *Written to Titus, ordained first Bishop of the Church of the Cretians, from Nicopolis of Macedonia.* Here it is said that this Epistle was written from *Nicopolis*, whereas it is cleare that *Paul* was not at *Nicopolis* when he wrote it. *Ti, 3. 12. Be diligent to come to me to Nicopolis, for I have determined there to winter.* He doth not say, *Here to winter*, but *there*; Where note, for the present hee was not there. And besides, it is said, that *Titus* was ordained the first Bishop, &c. And who was the second? or was there ever a second? And also He is said to be Bishop, not onely of a Diocesse, but of all *Creet*. Was there ever such a second Bishop? Adde, lastly, that it is said, *Bishop of the Church of the Cretians*; Whereas it would bee said of the Churches of the *Cretians*. For the Christian Churches of any Nation are called Churches by *Luke* and *Paul*, not Church. Therefore *Codex Claremontanus* subscribes; *Here ends the Epistle to Titus*, and no more. So the Syriack; *Finitur Epistola ad Titum qua scripta fuit a Nicopoli.* The old Vulgar Edition hath nothing of the Episcopacy of *Titus*. By all this it appeares, that if the Bishops had no more authority to urge us to subscribe to their Ceremonies, then they have authority for their Episcopall dignity by these Subscriptions, there would be no more Subscription to Ceremonies in the Churches of England.

But some will say, that there is one objection out of Scripture yet unanswered, and that is from the inequality that was betweene the twelve Apostles, and the seventy Disciples.

To which we answer;

First, that it cannot bee proved that the twelve Apostles had any superiority over the seventy, either of Ordination,

dination, or Jurisdiction. Or that there was any subordination of the seventy unto the twelve. But suppose it were, yet we answer.

Secondly, that a superiority and inferiority between Officers of different kindes, will not prove that there should be a superiority and inferiority between Officers of the same kinde. No man will deny but that in Christs time, there were Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Pastors, and teachers, and that the apostles were superior to Evangelists and Pastors. But it cannot be proved, that one apostle had any superiority over another apostle, or one Evangelist over another. And why then should one Presbyter be over another? Hence it followeth, that though we should grant a superiority between the twelve and the seventy, yet this will not prove the question in hand. Because the question is concerning Officers of the same kinde, and the instance is of Officers of different kinds, amongst whom no man will deny but there may be a superiority and inferiority, as there is amongst us between Presbyters and Deacons.

And now let your Honours judge (considering the premisses) how farre this Episcopall government is from any Divine right, or Apostolicall institution. And how true that speech of Hierome is, that a bishop as it is a superior Order to a Presbyter, is an *Humane presumption*, not a divine Ordinance.

But though Scripture failes them, yet the indulgence and Munificence of Religious Princes may support them, and to this the Remonstrant makes his next recourse, yet so as he acknowledgeth here, *Engagements to Princes onely for their accessory dignities, titles, and Maintenance; not at all for their stations and functions*, (wherein yet the author plainly acknowledgeth a difference betweene our Bishops and the Bishops of old by such accessions.)

For our parts, we are so farre from envying the gracious Munificence of pious Princes, in collating honourable maintenance upon the Ministers of Christ, that we beleeve,

that even by Gods own Ordinance double Honour is due unto them.

And that by how much the Ministry of the Gospel is more honourable then that of the Law; by so much the more ought all that embrace the Gospel, to bee carefull to provide, that the Ministers of the Gospel might not onely live, but maintaine Hospitality according to the Rule of the Gospel. And that worthy Gentleman spake as an Oracle; that said; That scandalous Maintenance is a great cause of a scandalous Ministry.

Yet wee are not ignorant, that when the Ministry came to have *Agros, domos, locationes, vehicula, equos, latifundia*, as *Chrysost.* *Hom.* 86. in *Matth.* That then *Religio peperit divitias*, & *filia devoravit Matrem*, religion brought forth riches, and the Daughter devoured the Mother; and then there was a voyce of Angels heard from Heaven; *Hoc venenum in Ecclesiam Christi decidit*, this Day is poyson shed into the Church of Christ.

And then it was that *Ierome* complained, *Christi Ecclesia postquam ad Christianos principes venit, potentia quidem & divitiis major, sed virtutibus minor facta est.* Then also was that Conjunction found true; That when they had wooden Chalice, they had golden Priests; but when their Chalice were golden, their Priests were wooden.

And though we doe not thinke, there is any such impossibility, but that large Revenues may be happily managed with an humble sociablenesse, yet it is very rare to finde. History tells us, that the superfluous revenues of the Bishops not onely made them neglect their Ministry, but further ushered in their stately and pompous attendance; which did so elevate their Spirits, that they insulted over their brethren, both *Clergy* and *People*, and gave occasion to others to hate and abhorre the Christian Faith, Which *Eusebius* sets forth fully in the pride of *Paulus Samosatenus*, who notwithstanding the meannesse and obscurity

scarcity of his birth, afterwards grew to that height of Insolency and pride in all his carriage; especially in that numerous train that attended him in the streetes, and in his stately throne raised after the manner of Kings and Princes, than *Fides nostra invidia, & odio, propter fastum & superbiam cordis illius, facta fuerit obnoxia*; the Christian faith was exposed to envy and hatred through his pride.

*Euseb. lib. 7.
cap. 29.*

And as their ambition (fed with the largeness of their revenues) discovered it selfe in great attendance, stately dwellings, and all Lordly pompe, so Hierom complaines of their pride in their stately seates, *qui velut in aliqua sublimi specula constituti, vix dignantur videre mortales & alloqui conservos suos*: who sitting aloft as it were in a watch tower, will scarce deigne to looke upon poore mortalls, or speake to their fellow servants.

Here we might bee large, in multiplying severall testimonies against the pride of Ecclesiasticall persons, that the largeness of their revenues rayfed them to: but we will conclude with that grave complaint of Sulpitius Severus.

Ille qui ante pedibus aut a sella consueverat, spumante equo superbia invehitur: parva prius ac vili cellula contentus habitare, erigit celsa Laquearia, construit multa conclavia, sculpsit postes, pingit armaria, vestem respuit grossiorem, indumentum molle desiderat, &c. Which because the practise of our times hath already turned into English, wee spare the labour to translate.

Onely suffer us (being now to give a Vale to our remonstrants arguments) to recollect some few things.

First, whereas this remonstrant saith; If we doe not shew out of the true & genuine writings of those holy men, that lived in the Apostles dayes a cleare and received distinction of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, as three distinct subordinate callings, with an evident specification of the duty belonging to each of them: Let this claimed Hierarchie be for ever rooted out of the Church: We beseech you let it be remembered how we have proved, out of the genuine and undeniable writings of the Apostles themselves; that these

Pag. 24.

are not three distinct callings : Bishops are Presbyters, being with them all one, Name and Office, and that the distinction of Bishops and Presbyters was not of Divine Institution, but Humane : and that these Bishops, in their first Institution did not differ so much from Presbyters, as our present Bishops differ from them.

Page 23.

Secondly, Whereas this remonstrant saith, *If our Bishops challenge any other power then was by Apostolike authority delegated to, and required of Timothy and Titus, and the Angells of the Asian Churches* : Let them bee disclaimed as usurpers. Wee desire it may be remembered, how wee have proved first ; that *Timothy and Titus* and the Angels were no Diocesan bishops ; and secondly, that our bishops challenge (if not in their Polemicks, yet in their Practicks) a power that *Timothy and Titus*, and those angels never did.

Page 22.

Thirdly, Whereas this remonstrant saith, *If there can be better evidence under Heaven for any matter of fact, let Episcopacy be for ever abandoned out of Gods Church* : We beseech you remember how weak we have discovered his Evidence to be ; and then the Inference upon all these we humbly leave to your Honours Wisedome and Justice.

SECT. XIII.

HAVING thus considered the validity of those arguments, whereby this remonstrant would suffult Episcopacy, we descend now to inquire, what satisfaction he gives to those objections, which himselfe frames as the maine, if not the sole arguments, that Episcopacy is assaultable by, and they are two.

First, that pleading the Divine right of Episcopacy, is to the prejudice of Sovereignty : Secondly, that it casts a dangerous imputation upon all those reformed Churches that want this Government.

To the first, the prejudice of Sovereignty ; he answers there is a compatiblenesse in this case of Gods Act, and the

the Kings : it is God that makes the Bishop, the King that gives the Bishopricke.

But we have proved already, that God never made a Bishop, as he stands in his *Superioritie* over all other *Presbyters*, he never had Gods *Fiat* : and if they disclaime the influence of sovereignty unto their creation to a priority, and assert, that the King doth not make them *Bishops*, they must have no being at all. Sure we are, the Lawes of the Land proclaime, that not onely *Bishopricks*, but *Bishops* 37. Hen. 8. cap. 17. and all the *Iurisdiction* they have is from the King : whereas the *Remonstrant* acknowledgeth no more, but the bare place and exercise to be from *Regall donation*, which cannot bee affirmed without apparent prejudice of that Sovereignty which the Lawes of the Land have invested our Princes with.

And for his unworthy comparison of Kings in order to *Bishops* and *Patrons* in order to their *Clerkes*, when he shall prove that the *patron* gives ministeriall power to his *Clerke*, as the King according to our Laws gives *Episcopall* power to the *Bishop*, it may be of some conducement to his cause, but till then, we leave the unsittesse of this comparison, and the unthankfulness of those men to the indulgence of their Sovereigne, to their deserved recompence.

His learned answer to such men as borrowing Saint *Ieroms* phrase, speake Saint *Pauls* truth, is in summe this : That he knowes not how to prescribe to mens thoughts, but for all his *Rhetoricke*, they will thinke what they list ; but if they will grant him the question, they shall soone be at an end of the quarrell : which one answer if Satisfactory, would silence all controversies to as good purpose as he did *Bellarmino*, who said, *Bellarmino* saith it is thus, and I say it is not, and where is *Bellarmino* now ?

To the second objection, that *Episcopacie* thus asserted casts an imputation upon all the reformed Churches, that want that Government, hee saith, that the objection is intended to raise envie against them ; who (if they may be beleeved) love and honour those sister Churches, and blesse God for them.

The Remonstrant here acknowledges the same of the King, that *Frier Simon*, a *Florentine*, did of the Pope, who affirmed the degree of a Bishop was *de jure divino*, but every particular Bishop *de jure Pontificio*. *Hist. con. Trid.* Pag. 28, 29.

Pag. 29.

But doe they not plucke all this envie upon themselves, who in their *Conferences, Writings, Pulpits, Universities, Disputes, High Commission, Declamations*, have disclaimed them as no Churches, that have disclaimed the Prelats? and have honoured the most glorious *Lights* of those Reformed Churches, Calvin, Beza, and others with no better titles than of *Rassalls, Blasphemers, &c.*

But the pith of his answer after a few good words is this: that no such consequent can be drawne from their opinion, for their *Ius divinum* pleads only for a *Iustificableness* of this holy calling: Not for an absolute necessity of it, warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had; but not fixing upon the Church that wants it, the defect of any thing of the *Essence* of a Church, but only of the glory and perfection of it; neither is it their sin, but their misery.

And is it so, doth not this *Ius divinum* argue a *Necessitie*, but onely a *Iustificableness* of this calling; nor is the want of it a want of any thing of *Essence*, but onely of perfection? wee had thought, that page the twentieth, where this *Remonstrant* strives to fetch the *pedegree* of *Episcopacie* from no lesse than *Apostolicall*, and in that right *Divine institution* he had reckoned it among those things, which the Apostles ordained for the succeeding administration of the Church in *essentia* matters: but here it seemes he is willing to retract what there fell from him: there it was to his advantage to say, this government was a thing essentiall to the Church, and here it is no lesse advantage to say, it is not essentiall.

But if it be not Essentiall, then what is the reason that when a *Priest* who hath received orders at *Rome* turnes to us, they urge not him to receive ordination among us againe: but when some of our brethren, who flying in *Queene Maries* dayes, had received *Imposition of hands* in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas returned againe in the dayes of *Queene Elizabeth*, they were urged to receive *Imposition of hands* againe from our Bishops, and some did receive it. If those Churches that want Bishops want nothing essentiall to a Church; then what

Essentiall

Essentiall want was there in the ordination of those *Ministers* that received Imposition of hands in those Churches, that might deserve a *Re-ordination*, more than if they had first received their ordination at *Rome*?

And what is the reason that *Bishop Mountague* so confidently affirmes, that Ordination by *Episcopall* hands is so necessary, as that the Church is no true Church without it, and the Ministry no true Ministry, and ordinarily no salvation to be obtained without it? And if this *Remonstrant* should leave *Bishop Mountague* to answer for himselfe, yet notwithstanding he stands bound to give us satisfaction to these two questions, which arise from his owne Booke.

*Originum Eccles.
sist. carum comi
prioris pars po-
sterior 463, 464*

First, whether that Office, which by divine right hath the sole power of *Ordaining*, and *Ruling* all other Officers in the Church, (as he saith *Episcopacy* hath) belong not to the being, but onely to the glory and perfection of a Church. Secondly, there being (in this mans thoughts) the same *Ius divinum* for Bishops, that there is for *Pastors* and *Elders*, whether if those *Reformed Churches* wanted *Pastors* and *Elders* too, they should want nothing of the Essence of a Church, but of the perfection and glory of it? Pag. 32.

But this *Remonstrant* seemes to know so much of the minde of those Churches, that if they might have their option, they would most gladly embrace *Episcopall Government*, as little differing from their owne *Moderatorship*, save onely in the perpetuallie of it, and the new Invention (as hee odiously calls it) of *Lay Elders*. But no question those learned *Worthies* that were entrusted by the Churches to compile their confessions, did comprise their Judgements better than the Composer of this *Remonstrance*. And to his presumption, wee oppose their Confession. Wee will begin with the French Church, who in their Confession speake thus.

Credimus veram Ecclesiam We beleeve that the true
gubernari debere ea politia, Church ought to be gover-
quam Dominus noster Iesus ned by that policie which
Christ

*Christus sancivit, ita videli-
cet, ut sint in ea Pastores, Pres-
byteri, sive Seniores, & Dia-
coni, ut doctrina puritas retinea-
tur, &c. Art. 29. Credimus om-
nes Pastores ubicunq; collocati
sunt, eadem & equali potesta-
te inter se esse preditos sub uno
illo capite summoque & solo
universalis Episcopo Iesu Chri-
sto. Art. 30. Gallica confessio-
nis. Credimus veram hanc Ec-
clesiam debere regi, ac guber-
nari, spirituali illa politione quam
nos Deus ipse in verbo suo edo-
cavit; ita ut sint in ea Pastores
ac ministri qui pure & concio-
nentur, & Sacramenta admi-
nistrent; sint quoq; Seniores, &
Diaconi qui Ecclesia senatum
constituant, ut his veluti me-
diis vera Religio conservari,
Hominesq; vitiis dediti spiri-
tualiter corripi & emendari
possint. Tunc enim rite & or-
dinatè omnia fiunt in Ecclesia,
cum viri fideles, & pii ad ejus
gubernationem deliguntur jux-
ta Divi Pauli prescriptum,
1 Tim. 3. Confes. Belgic. Art. 30. Ceterum ubicunq; locorum
sunt verbi Dei Ministri eandem atq; equalem Omnes habent
tum Potestatem tum AUTHORITY, ut qui sunt
æque Omnes Christi unici illius universalis Episcopi & capitis
Ecclesia Ministri.*

Christ Jesus our Lord esta-
blished, viz. that there bee
Pastors, Presbyters, or El-
ders and Deacons. And a-
gain, We beleeve that all
true Pastors where ever they
be, are endued with equall
and the same power, under
one chiefe Head and Bishop
Christ Jesus. Consonant to
this the Dutch Churches.
We beleeve (say they) the
true Church ought to be ru-
led with that spirituall poli-
cie which God hath taught
us in his Word, to wit, that
there bee in it Pastours to
preach the Word purely;
Elders and Deacons to con-
stitute the Ecclesiasticall Se-
nate, that by these meanes
Religion may be preserved,
and manners corrected. And
so again, We beleeve where
ever the Ministers of God
are placed, they All have the
same equall power and autho-
rity, as being All equally
the Ministers of Christ.

In which harmony of these Confessions, see how both
Churches agree in these five points :

I.

First, That there is in the Word of God, an exact forme
of

of Government set downe, *Deus in verbo suo edocuit.*

Secondly, That this forme of Government Christ established in his Church; *Iesus Christus in Ecclesiâ sanctis.*

Thirdly, That this forme of Government is by Pastors, Elders, and Deacons. 3

Fourthly, That the true Church of Christ ought to be thus governed; *Veram Ecclesiam debere regi.* 4

Fifthly, That all true Ministers of the Gospell are of equall power and Authority. 5

For the reason he assignes, why those Churches should make this Option, wee cannot enough admire that such a passage should fall from his pen, as to say, there is *Little difference betweene their episcopacie, and our Episcopacie, save onely in perpetuity and Lay Elders*, for who knowes not that between these two, there is as vast a difference as between the *Duke of Venice* and an *absolute Monarch*. For, 1. the Moderator in *Geneva* is not of a superiour order to his Brethren; nor 2. hath an ordination differing from them; nor 3. assumes power of sole Ordination or Jurisdiction; nor hath he 4. maintenance for that office above his Brethren; nor 5. a Negative voyce in what is agreed by the rest; nor 6. any further power then any of his Brethren. So that the difference betweene our Bishops and their Moderators is more then *Little*: But if it be so little as this *Remonstrant* here pretends; then the *Alteration* and *Abrogation* of *Episcopacie* will be with the lesse difficultie, and occasion the lesse disturbance.

S E C T. XV.

B't there is another thing, wherein our *Episcopacie* differs from the *Geneva Moderatorship*, besides the perpetuity; and that is the *exclusion of the Lay Presbytery*, (which if we may beleeeve this *Remonstrant*) never till this age had footing in the *Christian Church*.

In which assertion, this *Remonstrant* concludes so fully with Bishop *Halls Irrefragable Propositions*, and his
K other

other book of *Episcopacie* by *divine right*; as if he had conspired to swear to what the Bishop had said.

Now, though we will not enter the Lists with a man of that *learning* and *fame* that Bishop Hall is, yet we dare tell this *Remnant*, that this *his* assertion hath no more truth in it, *than the rest that wee have already noted*. Wee will (to avoyd prolixity) not urge those ^a three knowne Texts of Scripture, produced by some for the establishing of Governing Elders in the Church, *not yet vindicated by the adversaries*.

^a 1 Tim. 5. 17.
1 Cor. 12. 28.
Rom. 12. 8.

^b Vnde & Synagoga, & populus Ecclesia seniores habuit, quorum sine Consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia. Quod quia negligentia obsoletum est, nescio, nisi forte Doctorum desidia, aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri.
Origen. Lib. 3. contra Celsum.

Nor will wee urge that famous Text of ^b Ambrose in 1 Tim. 5. But if there were no *Lay Elders* in the Church till this present age, wee would be glad to learne, who they were of whom Origen speaks, when he tels us, it was the Custome of Christian Teachers, first to examine such as desired to heare them, of whom there were two orders; the first were *Catechumens*, or beginners; the other was of such as were more perfect: among whom *Nonnulli praposti sunt qui in vitam & mores eorum qui admittuntur inquirant, ut qui turpia committant his communi Catu Interdicant, qui vero ab istis abhorrent, ex animae complexi, meliores quotidie reddant*: There are some ordained to enquire into the life and manners of such as are admitted into the Church, that they may banish such from the publique Assembly, that perpetrate scandalous Acts; which place tells us plainly:

First, that there were some of the higher forme of heares (not Teachers) who were *Censores morum* over the rest. Secondly, that they were designed or constituted to this work, *παραστάται*. Thirdly, that they had such Authority intrusted into their hands, as that they might interdict such as were scandalous from the publique Assemblies. We would gladly know, whether these were not, as it were, *Lay Elders*.

That there were such in the Church (distinguished from others that were called to teach) appears. *Augustine* writing to his Charge directs his Epistle, *Dilectissimi*,

sumis fratribus, clero, senioribus & universa Plebi Ecclesia Hipponensis: where first there is the generall compellation. *Fratribus, Brethren*, then there is a distribution of these Brethren into the *Clergie*, the *Elders*, and the *whole People*; so that there were in that Church Elders distinguished both from the *Clergie*, and the rest of the *People*.

So againe, *Contra Cresconium Grammaticum: Omnes vos Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, & Seniores scitis*; All you *Lib. 3. cap.* Bishops, Elders, Deacons, and Elders, doe know. What were those two sorts of Elders there mentioned in one comma, & *ibidem cap. 56. Peregrinus Presbyter & seniores Ecclesie Amsiticae Regiones tale desiderium prosequuntur*; where againe we reade of *Elder and Elders, Presbyter, and Seniors* in one Church.

Both those passages are upon record in the publike acts, which are more fully set downe by *Baronius*, a^o. 303. Num. 15. 16, 17. As also by *Albaspineus*, in his Edition of *Opratus*: in which Acts the *Seniors* are often mentioned. In that famous relation of the purging of *Cecilianus* and *Felix*, there is a copie of a Letter; *Fratribus & filiis: Clero & Senioribus, Fortis in Domino aternam salutem*; Another Letter is mentioned a little before *Clericis & Senioribus Cirthenisum in Domino aternum Salutem*. These *Seniors* were interested in affaires concerning the Church as being the men, by whose advise they were managed.

The Letter of *Purpurinus* to *Silvanus* saith, *adhibete conclericos, & seniores plebis, Ecclesiasticos Viros, & inquirent quas sunt ista Dissensiones: ut ea quae sunt secundum fidei Praecepta fiant*, Where wee see the joynt power of these *Seniors*, with the *Clergie* in ordering Ecclesiasticall affaires; that by their wisdom and care peace might be settled in the Church; for which cause, these *Seniors* are called *Ecclesiasticall men*; and yet they are distinguished from *Clergie men*.

They are mentioned againe afterwards by *Maximus*, saying; *Loquor Nomine SENIORUM Populi Christiani*. *Greg. Mag.* distinguisheth them also from the *Clergie*:

Tabellarium cum consensu SENIORUM & Cleri ministeris Ordinandum.

These Seniors had power to reprove offenders, otherwise why should *Augustine* say, *Cum ob errorem aliquem à August. Ser. Senioribus arguuntur & imputatur alicui cur ebrius fueris, 19. de Verb. car res alienas pervaserit, &c.* when they were by the Elders reprov'd for their errors, and drunkenness is laid to a mans charge, &c. So that it was proper to the Seniors to have the cognizance of delinquents, and to reprove them.

August. in Psal. 38. Conc. 2.

The same *Augustine* in *Psalm* 36. *Necesse nos fuerat Primiani causam, quem, &c. Seniorum literis ejusdem Ecclesie postulanti bus audire.* Being requested by letters from the Seniors of that Church, it was needfull for me to heare the the cause of *Primian*, &c.

So againe, *Optatus*, who mentioning a persecution that did for a while scatter the Church, saith, *Erant Ecclesia ex auro & argento quàm plurima Ornamenta, quæ nec de fodere terra, nec secum portare poterat, quare fidelibus senioribus commendavit.* *Albaspineus*, that learned Antiquarie, on that place acknowledges, that Besides the Clergie, there were certaine of the Elders of the people, men of approved life, that did tend the affaires of the Church, of whom this place is to be understood.

By all these testimonies it is apparent; first, that in the ancient Church there were some called *Seniors*. Secondly, that these Seniors were not Clergie men. Thirdly, that they had a stroke in governing the Church, and managing the affaires thereof. Fourthly, that Seniors were distinguished from the rest of the people.

Pag. 32.

Neither would we desire to chuse any other Judges in this whole controversie; then whom himselfe constituted; Forraine Divines, taking the generall Suffrage and practise of the Churches, and not of particular men.

As for the learned *Spanhemius* whom hee produceth, though wee give him the deserved honour of a worthy man: yet wee think it too much to speake of him, as if the judgement of the whole Church of Geneva were incorporated

porated into him, as this Remonstrant doth. And for *Spanhemius* himselfe, we may truly say, in the place cited, he delivered a *complement*, rather than his *judgment*, which in *Dedicatorie Epistles* is not unusuall. Wee know that reverend *Calvin* and learned *Beza* have said as much upon occasion in their *Epistles*, and yet the Christian world knowes their Judgement was to the contrary.

Little reason therefore hath this Remonstrant, to de- Pag. 33.
 claime against all such as speake against this Govern-
 ment as unlawfull, with the termes of *Ignorant* and *spite- Pag. 33.*
full Seditaries, because they call the Governement unlaw-
 full: had they proceeded further to call it Antichristian,
 (which he charges upon them) they had said no more,
 then what our eares have heard some of their principall
 Agents, their *Legati à Latere* speake publikely in their
visitations: That how ever the Church of England be as D. Ducke.
sound, and Orthodox in her Doctrine as any Church in the
world; yet in our Discipline and Governement, wee are the
same with the Church of Rome, which amounts to as much
as to say, the Governement is Antichristian, unlesse they
will say the Governement of Rome is not so, nor the Pope
Antichrist.

S E C T. XVI.

NOW our Remonstrant begins to leave his dispute for
 the Office, and flowes into the large praises of the
 Persons, and what is wanting in his Arguments for the
 Place, thinks to make up in his *Encomiasticks* of the Per-
 sons, that have possesst that place in the Church of God; and
 tels us, that the Religious Bishops of all times are and have
 been they, that have strongly upheld the truth of God against
 Satan and his Antichrist. It is well he sets this crown only
 upon the heads of Religious Bishops, as knowing that there Pag. 34.
 are and have been some Irreligious ones, that have as strong-
 ly upheld Satan and his Antichrist against the truth of God.
 But the Religious Bishops are they that have all times upheld
 the truth. What? they, and only they? did never any uphold

the truth, but a *Religious Bishop*? did never any Religious Minister or Professor preach, or write, or die, to uphold the truth, but a *Religious Bishop*? if so then there is some perswasive strength in that hee saith; and a credulous man might bee induced to thinke, *If Bishops goe downe, truth will goe downe too*. But if wee can produce for one Bishop many others that gave beene valiant for the truth, this Rhethoricall insinuation will contribute no great help to their establishment. Nor indeed any at all; unles he were able to make this good of our times, as well as of all others, which he assaies; for saith he, *even amongst our own how many of the reverend & learned Fathers of the Church now living, have spent their spirits, & worne out their lives in the powerfull opposition of that man of sinne*; how many? I fir; wee would faine know how many: that there are some that have stood up to beare witness against that *Man of sin*, we acknowledge with all due respect, to the Learning and worth of their Persons. But that their Episcopall dignity hath added either any flame to their zeal, or any Nerves to their ability: we cannot believe, nor can we thinke they would have done lesse in that cause, though they had beene no Bishops.

But what if this be true of some Bishops in the Kingdome, Is it true of all? are there uot some that have spent their spirits in the opposition of Christ, as others have in the opposition of Antichrist? & are there none but Zealous, Religious Prelates in the Kingdome? are there none upon whom the guilt of that may meritoriously bee charged, which others have convincingly and meritoriously opposed? And are there not some Bishops in the Kingdome, that are so far from opposing the *Man of sin*, that even this Remonstrant is in danger of suffering under the name of Peritan for daring to call him by that name, we doubt not but this Remonstrant knowes there are.

But if he will against the light of his own Conscience, bear up a known error out of private repeers, (wee will not say these papers) but his own conscience, shall owne day be an evidence against him before the dreadfull Tribunall of the Almighty.

But

Pag. 35.

a Wee may rather thinke that they would have done more. Remembring what Martinus was wont to say to his friend Sulpitius, Nequaquam sibi in Episcopatu eam virtutum Gratiā superasse, quam prius se habuisse meminisset. Sulpitius Severus Dial. 2.

Pag. 35.

Pag. 35.

But there is yet a second thing that should endear *Episcopacie*, and that is the carefull, peaceable, painefull, *conscionable manning of their Charges; to the great glory of God, and the comfort of his faithful people.* Which (in not seeming to urge) hee urgeth to the full and beyond. This care, conscience, paines of our Bishops, is exercised and evidenced, either in their Preaching or in their Ruling; for their preaching, it is true, some few there are that *Labour in the Word and Doctrine*; whose persons in that respect wee honour: but the most are so farre from Preaching, that they rather discountenance, discourage, oppose, blaspheme Preaching.

It was a *Non-preaching Bishop*, that said of a *preaching Bishop*, *He was a preaching Coxcomb.* As for the discharge of their office of ruling, their entrusting their *Chancellors*, and other Officers, with their visitations, and Courts (as ordinarily they doe, whiles themselves attend the Court) doth abundantly witness their care in it. The many and loud cries of the intolerable oppressions and tyrannies of their Court-proceedings witness their peaceablenesse, their unjust fees, exactions, commutations; witness their conscionablenesse in manning their Charges, to the great glory of God, and the comfort of his faithful people.

And hence it is that so many at this day here ill; (how deservedly, saith this Remonstrant, God knows) and doe not your Honours know, and doth not this Remonstrant know? and doth not all the nation (that will know anything) know how deservedly Some, nay, Most, nay, *All the Bishops of this nation* heare ill, were it but onely for the late Canons and Oath? But why should the faults of some, diffuse the blame to all? Why? by your owne argument, that would extend the deserts of some; to the patronage of All; and if it bee a fault in the impetuous and undistinguishing Vulgar, so to involve all, as to make Innocency it selfe a sinne; what is it in a Man able to distinguish, by the same implication, to shrowd sinne under Innocencie, the sinne of many, under the Innocencie of a few.

But

Pag. 37.

But have our Bishops indeed beene so carefull, painfull, conscionable, in managing their Charges? how is it then that there are such manifold scandalls of the inferiour Clergy presented to your Honours view, which he cannot mention without a bleeding heart; and yet could finde in his heart (if he knew how) to excuse them, and though hee confesse them to be the shame and misery of our Church, yet is hee not ashamed to plead their cause at your Honours BARRE, Onuphrius-like, that was the Advocate of every bad cause; and to excite you by Constantines example (in a different Cause alledged) if not to suffer those Crimes, which himself calls hatefull, to passe unpunished, yet not to bring them to that open and publique punishment they have deserved.

But what, if pious Constantine (in his tender care to prevent the Divisions that the emulation of the Bishops of that age, enraged with a spirit of envie and faction, were kindling in the Church, lest by that meanes the Christian faith should be decided among the Heathens) did suppress their mutual accusations, many of which might be but upon surmises; and that not in a Court of Justice, but in an Ecclesiasticall Synode; shall this bee urged before the highest Court of Justice upon earth, to the patronizing of Notorious scandalls, and hatefull enormities, that are already proved by evidence of cleare witness.

Pag. 37.

But oh forbid it to tell it in Gath, &c. What? the sinne; alas, that is done already; Doe wee not know, the drunkenesse, profanenesse, superstition, Popishnesse of the English Clergie rings at Rome already? yes undoubtedly; and there is no way to vindicate the Honour of our Nation, Ministry, Parliaments, Sovereigne, Religion, God; but by causing the punishment to ring as farre as the sinne hath done; that our adversaries that have triumphed in their sinne, may be confounded at their punishments. Doe not your Honours know, that the plaistring or palliating of these rotten members, will be a greater dishonour to the Nation and Church, then their cutting off; and that

that the personall acts of these *sonnes of Beliall*, being con-
nived at, become Nationall sinnes?

But for this one fact of *Constantine*, wee humbly crave
your *Honours* leave to present to your wisdoms three
Texts of Scripture, *Ezek. 44. 12, 13.* *Because they mini-*
stred unto them before their Idolls, and caused the house of
Israel to fall into iniquity, therefore have I lift up my hand
unto them, saith the Lord, and they shall beare their iniquity.
And they shall not come neere unto mee, to doe the office of a
Priest unto me, nor to come neere unto any of mine holy things
in the most holy place, &c.

The second is *Jerem. 48. 10.* *Cursed be hee that doth the*
work of the Lord negligently: and the third is, Judges 6. 31.
He that will plead for Baal, let him be put to death while it is
yet morning. We have no more to say in this; whether it
be best to walk after the *President of Man*, or the *Prescript*
of God, your *Honours* can easily judge.

SECT. XVII.

But say saith this *Remonstrant*; and indeed he might *Pag. 39.*
Bwell have stayed and spared the labour of his ensuing
discourse, about the Church of *England*, the *Prelaticall*
and the *Antiprelaticall* Church: but these *Episcopall* Men
deale as the *Papists* that dazle the eyes, and astonish the
senses of poore people; with the glorious Name of the
Church, the Church; The holy Mother the Church. This is
the *Gorgons head*, as a *Doctor White* saith, that hath inchan-
ted them, and held them in bondage to their Errors: *a* In his Pre-
face to his
Booke, called
The way to
the True
Church.
Solinus.
All their speech is of the *Church, the Church*; no mention
of the *Scriptures*, of God the *Father*; but all of the *Mother*
the Church. Much like as they write of certaine *Aethio-*
pians, that by reason they use no marriage, but promis-
cuously company together, the children only follow the
Mother; the *Father* and his name is in no request, but the
Mother hath all the reputation. So is it with the Author
of this *Remonstrance*, he stiles himselfe, a *Dutifull sonne*
of the *Church.* And it hath beene a Custome of late times,

to cry up the holy *Mother the Church of England*, to call for absolute obedience to *holy Church*; full conformity to the orders of *holy Church*; Neglecting in the meane time, *God the Father, and the holy Scripture.*

Pag. 39.

But if wee should now demand of them, what they meane by the *Church of England*, this *Author* seemes to be thunder-stricken at this Question; and calls the very *Question*, a new Divinity; where he deales like such as holding great revenues by unjust Titles, will not suffer their Titles to be called in Question.

For it is apparent, *Ac si solaribus radiis descriptum esset* (to use *Tertullians* phrase) that the word *Church* is an *Equivocall word*, and hath as many severall acceptions as letters; and that *Dolus latet in universalibus*. And that by the *Church of England*; first by some of these men is meant onely the *Bishops*; or rather the two *Archbishops*; or more properly the *Archbishop of Canterbury*: Just as the *Jesuited Papists* resolve the *Church* and all the glorious Titles of it into the *Pope*; so do these into the *Archbishop*, or at fullest, they understand it of the *Bishops and their party met in Convocation*; as the more ingenuous of the *Papists*, make the *Pope and his Cardinals* to be their *Church*: thus excluding all the *Christian people and Presbyters of the Kingdome*; as not worthy to be reckoned in the number of the *Church*.

And which is more strange, this *Author* in his *Simplicitie* (as he truly saith) never heard, nor thought of any more *Churches of England* then one; and what then shal become of his *Diocesan Churches*, and *Diocesan Bishops*? And what shal wee think of *England*, when it was an *Heptarchy*? had it not then seven *Churches* when seven *Kings*? Or if the *Bounds of a Kingdome* must constitute the *Limits and Bounds of a Church*, why are not *England, Scotland, and Ireland*, all one *Church*? when they are happily united under one *gracious Monarch*, into one *Kingdome*. Wee reade in *Scripture*, of the *Churches of Iudea*, and the *Churches of Galatia*; and why not the *Churches of England*? not that we denie the *Confociation*, or *Combination*

nation of Churches into a Provinciall or Nationall Synod for the right ordering of them. But that there should be no Church in England, but a Nationall Church: this is that which this Author in his simplicity affirms, of which the very rehearfall is a refutation.

SECT. XVIII.

There are yet two things with which this Remonstrance shuts up it selfe, which must not be past without our Obeliskes.

First, he scoffes at the *Antiprelaticall Church*, and the *Antiprelaticall Divisions*; for our parts we acknowledge no *Antiprelaticall Church*. But there are a company of men in the Kingdome, of no meane ranke or quality, for Piety, Nobility, Learning, that stand up to beare witnesse against the Hierarchie (as it now stands:) their usurpations over Gods Church and Ministers, their cruell using of Gods people by their tyrannicall Governement: this we acknowledge; and if hee call these the *Antiprelaticall Church*, we doubt not but your Honours wil consider, that there are many Thousands in this Kingdome, and those pious and worthy persons, that thus doe, and upon most just cause.

It was a speech of Erasmus, of Luther, *Ut quisque vir est optimus, ita illius Scriptis minime offendi*, The better any man was, the lesse offence he tooke at Luthers writings: but we may say the contrary of the Prelates, *Ut quisque vir est optimus, ita illorum factis magis offendi*, The better any man is, the more he is offended at their dealings. And all that can be objected against this party, will be like that in Tertullian, *Bonus vir Cajus Sejus, sed malus tantum quia Antiprelaticus*.

Tertull. ad-
verb. Gens.

But he upbraides us with our *Divisions and Subdivisions*, and so doe the Papists upbraid the Protestants with their *Lutheranisme, Calvinisme, and Zuinglianisme*. And this is that the Heathens objected to the Christians, their Fractures were so many, they knew not which Religion

to chuse if they should turn Christians: And can it be expected that the Church in any age should be free from divisions, when the times of the Apostles were not free? and the Apostle tells us, it must needs be that there be divisions: in *Greg. Naz.* dayes there were 600 Errors in the Church; doe these any wayes derogate from the truth and worth of Christian Religion?

But as for the Divisions of the Antiprelaticall party, so odiously exaggerated by this Remonstrant: Let us assure your Honours, they have beene much fomented by the *Prelates*, whose practise hath beene according to that rule of *Machiavill: Divide & Impera*, and they have made these divisions, and afterwards complained of that which their Tyranny and Policie hath made. It is no wonder considering the pathes our Prelates have trod, that there are Divisions in the Nation. The wonder is our Divisions are no more, no greater; and wee doubt not but if they were of that gracious spirit, and so intirely affected to the peace of the Church as *Greg. Naz.* was, they would say as he did in the tumults of the people, *Mitte nos in mare, & non erit tempestas*; rather then they would hinder that sweet *Concordance*, and conspitation of minde unto a Government that shall be every way agreeable to the rule of Gods word, and profitable for the edification and flourishing of the Church.

Pag. 2.

Pag. 41.

A second thing, wee cannot but take notice of, is the pains this *Author* takes to advance his *Prelaticall Church*: and forgetting what he had said in the beginning: that their party was so numerous, it could not be summed; tells us now, these severall thousands are punctually calculated. But we doubt not but your Honours will consider that there may be *multi homines & pauci viri*. And that there are more against them then for them.

And whereas they pretend, that they differ from us onely in a Ceremony or an Organ pipe, (which however is no contemptible difference) yet it will appeare that our differences are in point of a superiour Alloy. Though this Remonstrant braves it in his multiplyed Quere's.

What

What are the bounds of this Church? what the distinction of Pag. 41.
the professors and Religion? what grounds of faith? what
new Creed doe they hold different from their Neigh-
bours? what Scriptures? what Baptisme? what meanes
of Salvation other then the rest? yet if hee pleased hee
might have silenced his owne Queres: but if hee will
needs put us to the answer, wee will resolve them one
by one.

First, if he ask what are the bounds of this Church, we answer him out of the sixt of their late founded Canons: where we find the limits of this Prelaticall Church extend as farre as from the high and lofty Promontory of Archbishops, to the *Terraincognita* of an, &c.

If what *Distinction of professors and Religion*; we answer their worshipping towards the East, and bowing towards the Altar, prostrating themselves in their approaches into Churches, placing all Religion in outward formalities, are visible differences of these professors and their Religion.

If what new Creed they have, or what grounds of Faith differing from their Neighbours, we answer; Episcopacy by divine right is the first Article of their Creed. Absolute and blinde obedience to all the commandements of the Church (that is the Bishop and his Emissaries) election upon faith foreseene, the influence of works into *Iustification*, falling from grace, &c.

If what *Scripture*, we answer; the Apocrypha and unwritten Traditions.

If what *Baptisme*? a Baptisme of absolute Necessity unto salvation; and yet insufficient unto salvation: as not sealing grace to the taking away of sinne after Baptisme.

If what *Eucharist*? an Eucharist that must be administered upon an Altar or a Table set Altar-wise, rayled in an Eucharist in which there is such a presence of Christ, (though *Modum nesciunt*) as makes the place of its Administration the throne of God, the place of the Residence of the Almighty; and impresteth such a holinesse upon it as

makes it not onely capable, but worthy of Adoration.

If what Christ? a Christ who hath given the same power of absolution to a Priest that himselfe hath.

If what Heaven? a heaven that hath a broad way leading thither, and is receptive of Drunkards, Swearers, Adulterers, &c. such a heaven as we may say of it, as the the Indians said of the heaven of the Spaniards: Unto that heaven which *some of the Prelaticall Church* living and dying in their scandalous sinnes, and hatefull enormities goe to, let our foules never enter.

If what meanes of salvation? we answer, confession of sinnes to a Priest as the most absolute, indoubted, necessary, infallible meanes of Salvation.

Page 41.

Farre be it from us to say with this *Remonstrant*, we do fully agree in all these and all other Doctrinall, and practicall points of Religion, and preach one and the same saving truths. Nay, we must rather say as that holy Martyr did, *We thank God we are none of you.*

Page 42.

Nor doe we because of this dissension feare the censure of uncharitablenesse from any but uncharitable men. But it is no unusuall thing with the Prelats and their party, to charge such as protest against their corrupt opinions and wayes, with uncharitablenesse and Schisme, as the Papists do the Protestants: and as the Protestants doe justly recriminate, and charge that Schisme upon the Papists, which they object to us; So may we upon the Prelats: And if *Austin* may be Judge, the Prelats are more Schismaticks then we. *Quicunque* (saith he) *invident bonis, ut querant occasiones excludendi eos, aut degradandi, vel crimina sua sic defendere parati sunt (si objecta vel prodita fuerint) ut etiam conventiculorum congregationes vel Ecclesie perturbationes cogitent excitare; jam schismatici sunt.* Whosoever envie those that are good, and seeke occasions to exclude and degrade them, and are so ready to defend their faults, that rather then they will leave them, they will devise how to raise up troubles in the Church, and drive men into Conventicles and corners, they are the Schismaticks.

And

And that all the world may take notice what just cause wee have to complaine of Episcopacie, as it now stands, wee humbly crave leave to propound these *Queries*.

Queries about Episcopacie.

VHether it be tolerable in a Christian Church, that Lord Bishops should be held to be *Iure Divino*; And yet the Lords day by the same men to be but *Iure Humano*. And that the same persons should cry up *Altars* in stead of *Communion Tables*, and *Priests* in stead of *Ministers*, and yet not *Judaize*, when they will not suffer the Lords day to be called the Sabbath day, for feare of *Judaizing*. Whereas the word *Sabbath* is a generall word, signifying a day of rest, which is common as well to the Christian Sabbath, as to the Jewish Sabbath, and was also used by the Ancients, *Ruffinus in Psal. 47. Origen Hom. 23. in Num. Gregory Nazian.*

Whether that assertion, No Bishop, No King, and no Ceremonie, no Bishop, be not very prejudiciall to Kingly Authoritie? For it seemes to imply, that the Civill power depends upon the Spirituall, and is supported by Ceremonies and Bishops.

Whether, seeing it hath beene proved that Bishops (as they are now asserted) are a meere humane Ordinance, it may not by the same Authoritie be abrogated, by which it was first established; especially, considering the long experience of the hurt they have done to Church and State.

Whether the advancing of Episcopacie into *Ius Divinum*, doth not make it a thing simply unlawfull to submit to that Government? Because that many conscientious men that have hitherto conformed to Ceremonies and Episcopacie, have done it upon this ground, as supposing that Authoritie did not make them matters of worship, but of Order and Decencie, &c. And thus they satisfied their consciences in answering those Texts, *Colos. 2. 20.*

21, 22. *Math. 15. 9.* But now since Episcopacy comes to be challenged as a Divine Ordinance, how shall wee be responsible to those Texts. And is it not, as it is now asserted, become an Idoll, and like the Brazen Serpent to be ground to powder?

15 Whether there be any difference in the point of Episcopacie between *Ius Divinum* and *Ius Apostolicum*. Because we finde some claiming their standing by *Ius Divinum*; others by *Ius Apostolicum*. But wee conceive that *Ius Apostolicum* properly taken, is all one with *Ius Divinum*. For *Ius Apostolicum* is such a *Ius*, which is founded upon the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, written by them so as to be a perpetuall Rule for the succeeding Administration of the Church, as this Author saith pag. 20. And this *Ius* is *Ius Divinum*, as well as *Apostolicum*. But if by *Ius Apostolicum*, they meane improperly (as some doe) such things which are not recorded in the writings of the Apostles, but introduced, the Apostles being living, they cannot be rightly said to be *jure Apostolico*, nor such things which the Apostles did intend the Churches should be bound unto. Neither is Episcopacie as it imports a superiority of power over a Presbyter, no not in this sense *jure Apostolico*, as hath beene already proved, and might further be manifested by divers Testimonies, if need did require. We will only instance in *Cassander*, a man famous for his immoderate moderation in controverted Points of Religion, who in his *Consultat. Articul. 14.* hath this saying; *An Episcopatus inter ordines Ecclesiasticos ponendus sit, inter Theologos & Canonistas non convenit. Convenit autem inter omnes, in Apostolorum aetate Presbyterum & Episcopum nullum discrimen fuisse, &c.*

6 Whether the distinction of *Beza*, betweene *Episcopus Divinus, Humanus, & Diabolicus*, be not worthy your Honours consideration. By the Divine Bishop, he meanes the Bishop as he is taken in Scripture, which is one and the same with a Presbyter; By the humane Bishop he meanes the Bishop chosen by the Presbyters to be President over them, and to rule with them by fixed Lawes and

and Canons. By the Diabolical Bishop he meanes a Bishop with sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, Lording it over Gods heritage, and governing by his owne will and authority. Which puts us in minde of the Painter that Limmed two pictures to the same proportion and figure; The one hee reserved in secret, the other he exposed to common view. And as the phanſie of beholders led them to censure any line or proportion, as not done to the life, he mends it after direction. If any fault bee found with the eye, hand, foot, &c. he corrects it, till at last the addition of every mans fancie had defaced the first figure, and made that which was the Picture of a man, swell into a monster: Then bringing forth this and his other Picture which hee had reserved, he presented both to the people. and they abhorring the former, and applauding the latter, he cryed, *Hunc populus fecit*: This the deformed one the People made: This lovely one I made. As the Painter of his Painting, so (in *Bezars* sence) it may be said of Bishops, God at first instituted Bishops such as are all one with presbyters; and such are amiable, honourable in all the Churches of God. But when men would bee adding to Gods institution, what power, preheminence, Jurisdiction; Lordlynes their phanſie suggested unto them, this divine Bishop lost his Originali beauty, and became to be *Humanns*. And in conclusion (by these and other additions swelling into a Pope) *Diabolicus*.

Hunc populus fecit.

Whether the Ancient Fathers, when they call *Peter Marke, James, Timothy, and Titus* Bishops, did not speak according to the Language of the times wherein they lived, rather then according to the true acception of the word Bishop; and whether it bee not true which is here said in this Booke, that they are called Bishops of *Alexandria, Ephesus, Hierusalem, &c.* in a very improper sence, because they abode at those places a longer time then at other places? For sure it is, if Christ made *Peter* and *James* Apostles (which are Bishops over the whole world) and the Apostles made *Marke, Timothy* and *Titus* Evange-

lifts. &c. It seemes to us that it would have beene a great sinne in them to limit themselves to one particular Diocesse, and to leave that calling in which Christ had placed them.

8. Whether Presbyters in Scripture are called *ἐπίσκοποι* and *πρεσβύτεροι*, and that it is an office, required at their hands, to rule and to governe, as hath beene proved in this Booke; The Bishops can without sinne arrogate the exercise of this power to themselves alone; And why may they not with the same lawfulnessse, impropriate to themselves alone the Key of Doctrine (which yet notwithstanding all would condemne) as wel as the Key of Discipline, seeing that the whole power of the Keyes is given to Presbyters in Scripture as well as to Bishops; as appears, *Mat. 16. 19.* where the power of the Keyes is promised to *Peter*, in the name of the rest of the Apostles, and their successors; and given to all the Apostles, and their successors, *Mat. 18. 19. Iohn 20. 23.* And that Presbyters succeed the Apostles appears not onely *Mat. 28. 20* but also *Acts 20. 28.* where the Apostle ready to leave the Church of *Ephesus* commends the care of ruling and feeding it to the Elders of that Church. To this *Irenaeus* witnesseth, *lib. 4. cap. 43. 44.* This Bishop *Jewell* against *Harding*, *Artic. 4. sect. 5. 6.* faith, that all Pastors have equall power of binding and loosing with *Peter*.

9. Whether since that Bishops assume to themselves power temporall (to be Barons and to sit in Parliament, as Judges, and in Court of Star-Chamber, High Commission, and other Courts of Justice) and also power spirituall over Ministers and People to ordaine, silence, suspend. deprive, excommunicate, &c. their spirituall power be not as dangerous (though both bee dangerous) and as much to be opposed as their temporall? 1. Because the spiritual is over our consciences, the temporall, but over our purses, 2. Because the spirituall have more influence into Gods Ordinances to defile them, then the temporall. 3. Because spirituall Judgements and evils are greater then

then other, 4. because the Pope was Antichrist, before he did assume any temporall power. 5. Because the Spirituall is more inward and lesse discerned: and therefore it concernes all those that have Spirituall eyes, and desire to worship God in spirit and truth to consider, and and endeavour to abrogate their Spirituall usurpations as well as their Temporall.

Whether *Aerius* bee justly branded by *Epiphanius* and *Austin* for a Hereticke (as some report) for affirming Bishops, and presbyters to be of an equall power?

10.

Wee say, as some report, for the truth is, he is charged with heresie meerely and onely because he was an *Arian*. As for his opinion of the parity of a presbyter with a Bishop; this indeede is called by *Austin*, *proprium dogma Aerii*, the proper opinion of *Aerius*. And by *Epiphanius* it is called *Dogma furiosum & stolidum*, a mad and foolish opinion, but not an heresie neither by the one nor the other. But let us suppose (as is commonly thought) that he was accounted an Hereticke for this opinion: yet notwithstanding, that this was but the private opinion of *Epiphanius*, and borrowed out of him by *Austin*, & an opinion not to be allowed appears;

Epiphanius

saith he did

*Aerium ipsum dogmatum novitate superare.**Austin* saith in*Arianorum**heresin lapsus.*

First, because the same Authors condemne *Aerius*, as much for reprehending and censuring the mentioning of the dead in the publique prayers, and the performing of good works for the benefit of the dead. And also for the reprehending *statu jejunia*, and the keeping of the week before Easter as a solemne Fast; which if worthy of condemnation, would bring in most of the reformed Churches into the censure of Heresie.

Epiphanius accu-

sed him be-

cause he said

that *superstitum**preces* did not*opitulari eis qui**ex hac vita dis-**cesserunt.* And*Austin* accused*Aerius* becausehe said, *Non li-**cet orare, vel of-**ferre pro mor-**tuis oblationem.*

Secondly, because not onely Saint *Hierome*, but *Austin* himselfe, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact*, were of the same opinion with *Aerius* (as *Michael Medina*, observes in the Councell of *Trent*, and hath written, *Lib. 1. de sacr. hom. Origine*) and yet none of these deserving the name of Fools, much lesse to be branded for Hereticks.

Thirdly, because no Counsell did ever condemne this

Whitaker re-
spons. ad Cam-
pian rat. 10.
hath these
words:

*Aerium Epi-
phanus & Au-
gustinus in here-
ticis numerant,
& prater eos
antiqui pauci. Et
si Presbyterum
Episcopo equare
sit hereticum,
nihil Catholicam
esse potest. Cum
Aerio Hierony-
mus de Presby-
teris omnino sen-
sit. Illos enim
jure divino E-
piscopis aequales
esse statuit.*

11.

12.

*Sozomen. hist.
lib. 6. cap. 10.*

13.

for Heresie; but on the contrary, *Concilium Aquisgra-
nens. sub Ludovico Pio Imp. 1. anno 816.* hath approved
it for true Divinitie out of the Scripture: That Bishops &
Presbyters are equall, bringing the same texts that *Aerius*
doth, and which *Epiphanius* indeed undertakes to an-
swer; but how slightly let any indifferent Reader
judge.

Whether the great Apostacie of the Church of *Rome*
hath not been, in swarving from the Discipline of Christ,
as well as from the doctrine. For so it seems by that text.

2. *Thess. 2. 4.* And also *Revel. 18. 7.* and divers others.

And if so, then it much concernes all those that desire
the purity of the Church to consider, how neere the disci-
pline of the Church of England borders upon Antichrist;
least, while they indeavour to keepe out Antichrist from
entring by the doore of doctrine, they should suffer him
secretly to creep in by the doore of discipline, especi-
ally considering, what is heere said in this Booke. That
by their owne confession, *the discipline of the Church of
England is the same with the Church of Rome.*

Whether Episcopacy be not made a place of Dignity,
rather then Duty, and desired onely for the great revenues
of the place: And whether, if the largenesse of their re-
venues were taken away, Bishops would not decline the
great burthen and charge of soules necessarily annexed to
their places, as much as the ancient Bishops did, who hid
themselves, that they might not be made Bishops and cut
off their cares, rather then they would bee made Bishops:
wheras now Bishops cut off the cares of those that speak
against their Bishopricks.

How it comes to passe, that in England there is such
increase of Popery, superstition, Arminianisme; and pro-
fanenesse more then in other reformed Churches; Doth
not the root of these disorders proceed from the Bishops
and their adherents, being forced to hold correspondence
with Rome, to uphold their greatnesse, and their Courts
and Canons, wherein they symbolize with Rome; And
whether it bee not to be feared, that they will rather con-
sent

sent to the bringing in of Popery, for the upholding of their dignities, then part with their dignities for the upholding of Religion.

Why should England that is one of the chiefest Kingdomes in Europe, that seperates from Antichrist, maintaine and defend a discipline different from all other reformed Churches, which stand in the like Separation? And whether the continuance in this discipline will not at last bring us to communion with Rome from which wee are separated, and to separation from the other reformed Churches, unto which wee are united.

14

Whether it bee fit that the name Bishop, which in Scripture is common to the Presbyters with the Bishops (and not onely in in Scripture, but also in Antiquitie for some hundreds of yeeres) should still bee appropriated to Bishops, and ingrossed by them, and not rather to bee made common to all Presbyters; and the rather because:

15

First we finde by wofull experience, that the great Equivocation that lyeth in the name Bishop hath beene and is at this day a great prop & pillar to uphold Lordly Prelacy, for this is the great *Goliath*, the master-peece, and indeed the onely argument with which they thinke to silence all opposers. To wit, the antiquity of Episcopacie, that it hath continued in the Church of Christ for 1500 yeeres, &c, which argument is cited by this Remonstrant *ad nauseam usque & usque*. Now it is evident that this argument is a *Paralogisme*, depending upon the Equivocation of the name Bishop. For Bishops in the Apostles time were the same with Presbyters in name and office and so for a good while after. And when afterwards they came to bee distinguished. The Bishops of the primitive times differed as much from ours now, as Rome ancient from Rome at this day, as hath beene sufficiently declared in this Booke. And the best way to confute this argument is by bringing in a Community of the Name Bishop to a Presbyter as well as to a Bishop.

Secondly,

Secondly, because wee finde that the late Innovators which have so much disturbed the peace & purity of our Church, did first begin with the alteration of words; and by changing the word Table into the word Altar; and the word Minister, into the word Priest; and the word Sacrament into the word Sacrifice, have endeavoured to bring in the Popish Masse. And the Apostle exhorts us, *2 Tim. 1. 13. To hold fast the forme of sound words*; and *1 Tim. 6. 20. to avoid the prophane novelties of words*. Upon which text we will onely mention what the Rhemists have commented, which wee conceive to be worthy consideration. (*Nam instrunt nos non solum docentes, sed etiam errantes*) The Church of God hath alwayes been as diligent to resist novelties, of words, as her adversaries are busie to invent them, for which cause shee will not have us communicate with them, nor follow their fashions and phrase newly invented, though in the nature of the words sometimes there bee no harme. Let us keepe our forefathers words, and wee shall easily keepe our old and true faith, that wee had of the first Christians; let them say Amendment, Abstinence, the Lords Supper, the Communion Table, Elders, Ministers, Superintendent, Congregation, so be it; praise yee the Lord, Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer and the rest, as they will, Let us avoide those novelties of words, according to the Apostles prescript and keepe the ole termes, Penance, Fast, Priests, Church, Bishop, Masse, Mattin, Evensong, the B. Sacrament, Altar, Oblation. Host, Sacrifice, Halleluja, Amen; Lent, Palme-Sunday, Christ-masse, and the words will bring us to the faith of our first Apostles, and condemne these new Apostates, new faith and phrase.

Quest. 16.

Whether having proved that God never set such a government in his Church as our Episcopall Government is wee may lawfully any longer be subject unto it, bee present at their Courts, obey their injunctions and especially bee instruments in publishing, and executing their Excommunications and Absolutions.

And

And thus we have given (as wee hope) a sufficient answer, and as briefe as the matter would permit, to *The Remonstrant*. With whom, though we agree not in opinion touching *Episcopacie* and *Liturgie*; yet we fully consent with him, to pray unto Almighty God, *Who is great in power, and infinite in wisdom*, to powre downe upon the whole Honourable Assembly, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of Councell and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the feare of the Lord. That you may be able to discerne betwixt things that differ; separate betweene the precious and the vile, purely purge away our drosse, and take away all our tinne; root out every plant that is not of our heavenly Fathers planting. That so you may raise up the foundations of many generations, and be called *The Repairers of breaches, and Restorers of paths to dwell in*. Even so, Amen.

FINIS.

And thus we have given (as was hoped) a luminous
view, and as it is the matter would permit, to the
Reader. With which, though we agree not in
union touching the points and things; yet we wish
you with him, to pray unto Almighty God who is great
in power, and is able in us here, to cause down upon the
world, the Spirit of wisdom, the Spirit of light, and the
Spirit of the Lord, that you may be a
knowledge and of the Lord. That you may be a
to the Spirit of the Lord; for the Spirit of the Lord
the Spirit and the Spirit, which bring away our will, and
take away all our sin; and every place that is not of our
own will, and the Spirit. That for you may have the
John 14:26 of many promises, which I call the
Repentance of Sinners, and Repentance of
Sins to the Lord. Amen.



A POSTSCRIPT.

THough we might have added much light and beauty to our Discourse, by inserting variety of Histories upon severall occasions given us in the *Remonstrance*, the answer whereof wee have undertaken; especially where it speaks of the *bounty* and *gracious Munificence* of *Religious Princes* toward the *Bishops*, yet unwilling to break the thread of our discourse, and its connexion with the *Remonstrance*, by so large a digression, as the whole series of History producible to our purpose, would extend unto: Wee have chosen rather to subjoyne by way of *appendix*, an historicall Narration of those bitter fruits, *Pride, Rebellion, Treason, Unthankfulness*, &c. which have issued from *Episcopacy*, while it hath stood under the continued influences of *Soveraigne goodnesse*. Which Narration would fill a volume, but we wil bound our selves unto the Stories of this Kingdome, and that revolution of time which hath passed over us since the erection of the *See of Canterbury*. And because in most things the beginning is observed to be a preface of that which followes, let their Founder *Austin the Monk* come first to be considered. Whom wee may justly account to have beene such to the English, as the *Arrian Bishops* were of old to the *Goths*, and the *Jesuits* now among the *Indians*, who of *Pagans* have made but *Arrians* and *Papists*. His ignorance in the *Gospell* which he preached is seene in his idle and *Judaicall* Consultations with the *Pope*, about things cleane and uncleane; his proud demeanour toward the *British Clergy*, appeares in his coun-

N

sell

Bed.
Holinsh.
Speed.

fell called about no solid point of faith, but celebration of Easter, where having troubled & threatened the Churches of Wales, and afterwards of Scotland, about Romish Ceremonies, hee is said in fine to have beene the stirrer up of *Ethelbert*, by meanes of the Northumbrian King, to the slaughter of twelve hundred of those poore laborious Monks of Bangor. His Successors busied in nothing but urging and instituting Ceremonies, and maintaining precedence we passe over.

Holinsh. out of Capgrave. Osborn, Higden. Till *Dunstan*, the Sainted Prelate, who of a frantick Necromancer, and suspected fornicatour, was shorne a Monk, and afterwards made a Bishop. His worthy deeds are noted by *Speed* to have beene the cheating King *Edred* of the treasure committed to his keeping; the prohibiting of marriage, to the encreasing of all filthinesse in the Clergie of those times; as the long Oration of King *Edgar* in *Stow* well testifies.

Edw. Conf. In *Edward* the Confessors dayes, *Robert* the Norman no sooner Archbishop of Canterbury, but setting the King and Earle *Godwine* at variance for private revenge broached a civill warre, till the Archbishop was tanisht.

Holinsh. 191 Will. Conq. Now *William* the Conquerour had set up *Lanfrank* Bishop of Canterbury, who to requite him, spent his faithfull service to the Pope *Gregorie*, in perswading the King to subject himselfe and his state to the Papacy as himselfe writes to the Pope. *Suasi, sed non persuasi.*

Will. Ruf. The treason of *Anselm* to *Rufus* was notorious, who not content to withstand the King, obstinately in money matters made suit to fetch his Pall or investiture of Archiepiscopacie from Rome, which the King denying as flat against his regall Sovereigntie, he went without his leave, and for his Romish good service received great honour from the Pope, by being seated at his right foot in a Synod, with these words, *Includamus hunc in orbe nostra tanquam alterius orbis Papam.* Whence perhaps it is that the Sea of Canterbury hath affected a Patriarchy in our dayes. This *Anselm* also condemned the married Clergie.

Henry the first reigning, the same *Anselm* deprived Henry 1. those Prelats that had beene invested by the King, and all the Kingdome is vext with one Prelat, who the second time betakes himselfe to his old fortresse at Rome, till the King was faine to yeeld. Which done, and the Archbishop returned, spends the rest of his dayes in a long contention and unchristian jangling with *York* about Primacie. *Holinsh. 37.* Which ended not so, but grew as hot betweene *York* and *London*, as Dean to Canterbury, striving for the upper seat at dinner, till the King seeing their odious pride, put them both out of dores.

To speak of *Ralf*, and *Thurstan*, the next Archbishops, *Holinsh. 38.* pursuing the same quarrell, were tedious, as it was no small molestation to the King and Kingdome; *Thurstan* refusing to stand to the Kings doome, and wins the day, or else the King must be accurs'd by the Pope; which further animates him to try the mastery with *William* next Archbishop of Canterbury, and no man can end it but their Father the Pope, for which they travel to Rome. In the mean while, marriage is sharply decreed against, *Speed 448.* and the Legate *Cremonensis*, the declamor against matrimony taken with a strumpet the same night.

In King *Stephens* Reigne, the haughty Bishops of *K. Stephen.* Canterbury and Winchester bandy about precedencie; and to Rome to end the duell. *Theobald* goes to Rome against *Holinsh. 57.* the Kings will; interdicts the Realme, and the King forc't to suffer it; till refusing to Crowne *Enstace* the Kings sonne, because the Pope had so commanded, he flies againe. *58.*
59.

Becket's pride and outrageous treasons are too manifest; *Henry 2.* resigning the Kings gift of his Archbishoprick to receive it of the Pope; requiring the Custody of Rochester Castle, and the Tower of London, as belonging to his Seignorie. Protects murdering Priests from the temporall *Speed 467.* sword; standing stiffly for the liberties and dignities of out of *Nu-* Clerkes, but little to chastise their vices, which besides *brigens.* other crying finnes, were above a hundred murders since *Henry* the seconds crowning, till that time: to maintaine

Yet this mans
life is lately
printed in En-
glish as a thing
to be imitated.

Holinsh. 70.

Speed. 469.

which, most of the Bishops conspire, till terror of the King made them shrink; but *Becket* obdures, denies that the King of Englands Courts have authority to judge him. And thus was, this noble King disquieted by an insolent traitor, in habit of a Bishop, a great part of his Reigne; the land in uproar; many excommunicate, and accursed. France and England set to warre, and the King himselfe curbed, and controlled; and lastly, disciplin'd by the Bishops and Monks, first with a bare foot penance, that drew blood from his feet, and lastly, with fourescore lashes on his anointed body with rods.

Hol. pag. 98.

Richard I.
Pag. 129.

130.

133.

144.
K. John.

Speed. 503

Speed. 509

In the same Kings time it was that the Archbishop of York, striving to sit above Canterbury, squatts him down on his lap, whence with many a cuffe hee was throwne downe.

Next the pride of *W. Longchamp*, Bishop of Elie was notorious, who would ride with a thousand horse, and of a Governour in the Kings absence, became a Tyrant; for which flying in womans apparell he was taken.

To this succeeds contention betweene Canterbury and York, about carriage of their crosses, and Rome appeal'd to: the Bishop of Durham buyes an Earldome.

No sooner another King, but *Hubert* another Archbishop to vex him, and lest that were not enough, made Chancellor of England. And besides him, *Geffry* of York, who refusing to pay a Subsidy within his Precincts, and therefore all his temporalities seiz'd; excommunicates the Sheriffe, beats the Kings Officers, and interdicts his whole Province. *Hubert* outbraves the King in Christ-masse house-keeping: hinders King *John* by his Legantine power from recovering Normandy. After him *Stephen Langton*, set up by the Pope in spight of the King, who opposing such an affront, falls under an interdict, with his whole Land; and at the suit of his Archbishop to the Pope, is depos'd by Papall Sentence; his Kingdome given to *Philip* the French King, *Langtons* friend, and lastly, resignes and entails his Crowne to the Pope.

After

After this tragicall *Stephen*, the fray which *Boniface Hen. 3.*
 the next Archbishop but one had with the Canons of
Saint Bartholmews is as pleasant; the tearing of Hoods *Stow 188.*
 and Cowles, the miring of Copes, the flying about of
 wax Candles, and Censers in the scuffle, cannot be ima-
 gined without mirth; as his oathes were lowd in this
 bickering, so his curles were as vehement in the conten- *Hol. 247.*
 tion with the Bishop of *Winchester* for a slight occasion.
 But now the Bishops had turned their contesting into
 base and servile flatteries, to advance themselves on the
 ruine of the Subjects. For *Peter de Rupibus* Bishop of *Win-*
chester perswading the King to displace English Officers
 and substitute Poictivines, and telling the Lords to their
 ces, that there were no Peeres in *England*, as in *France*, *Speed 529.*
 but that the King might do what he would, and by whom *530.*
 he would, became a firebrand to the civill warres that
 followed.

In this time *Peckam* Archbishop of *Can.* in a Synod was *Edward 1.*
 tempering with the Kings liberties, but being threatned *Hol. 280.*
 desisted. But his successor *Winchelsey* on occasion of Subsi-
 dies demanded of the Clergie, made answer, That having *Hol. 301.*
 two Lords, one Spirituall, the other Temporall, he ought
 rather to obey the Spirituall governour the Pope, but that *Hol. 315.*
 he would send to the Pope, to know his pleasure, and so
 persisted even to beggerie. The Bishop of *Durham* also
 cited by the King flies to *Rome*.

In the deposing of this King who more forward, then *Edward 2.*
 the Bishop of *Hereford*? witnesse his Sermon at *Oxford*, *Speed 574.*
 My head, my head aketh concluding that an aking, and
 sick head of a King was to be taken off without further
 Physick.

John the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, suspected to hinder *Edward 3.*
 the Kings glorious victories in *Flanders*, and *France*, by *Speed 586.*
 stopping the conveyance of moneys committed to his
 charge, conspiring therein with the Pope. But not long
 after was constituted that fatall *premunire*, which was the
 first nipping of their courage, to seeke aide at *Rome*. And
 next to that, the wide wounds, that *Wickleffe* made in *Hol. 409.*
 their

their sides. From which time they have beene falling, and thenceforth all the smoke, that they could vomit, was turned against the rising light of pure doctrine.

Richard 2.

Yet could not their pride finde occasion to set other mischief on foot. For the Citizens of *London* rising to apprehend a riotous servant of the Bishop of *Salisbury* then Lord Treasurer, who with his fellowes stood on his guard in the Bishops house, were by the Bishop, who maintained the riot of his servant, so complained of, that the King therewith seized on their liberties, and set a Governour over the Citie. And who knowes not, that *Thomas Arundell* Archbishop of *Canterbury* was a chiefe instrument, and agent in deposing King *Richard*, as his actions and Sermon well declares.

Hol. 478.

Pag. 506.

Henry 4.

The like intended the Abböt of *Westminster* to *Henry* the fourth, who for no other reason, but because hee suspected, that the King did not favour the wealth of the Church, drew into a most horrible conspiracie the Earles of *Kent*, *Rutland*, and *Salisbury*, to kill the King in a tournament at *Oxford*, who yet notwithstanding was a man that professed to leave the Church in better state then hee found it. For all this, soone after is *Richard Scroop* Archbishop of *York* in the field against him, the chiefe attractor of the rebellious party.

Pag. 514.

Speed 631.

Hol. 529.

Henry 5.

In these times *Thomas Arundell* a great persecutor of the Gospel preached by *Wisclefs* followers, dies a fearefull death, his tongue so swelling within his mouth, that hee must of necessity starve. His successor *Chicheley* nothing milder diverts the King, that was looking too neerely into the superfluous revenues of the Church, to a bloody warre.

Speed 638.

Henry 6.

All the famous conquests which *Henry* the fifth had made in *France*, were lost by a civill dissension in *England*, which sprung first from the haughty pride of *Beaufort* Bishop and Cardinall of *Winchester*, and the Archbishop of *York* against the Protector, *Speed 674*. In the civill warres the Archbishop sides with the Earle of *Warwick*, and *March* in *Kent*, *Speed 682*.

Hol. 596.

Pag. 620.

Edward

Edward the fourth, *Montacute* Archbishop of *York*, one of the chiefe conspirators with *Warwicke* against *Edward* the fourth, and afterwards his Jaylor, being by *Warwicke's* treason committed to this Bishop. *Edward 4. Speed 699.*

In *Edward* the fifts time, the Archbishop of *York* was, though perhaps unwittingly (yet by a certaine fate of of Prelacie) the unhappy instrument of pulling the young Duke of *York* out of Sanctuary, into his cruell Uncles hands. *Edward 5.*

Things being settled in such a peace, as after the bloodie brawles was to the afflicted Realme howsoever acceptable, though not such, as might bee wished: *Morton* Bishop of *Ely*, enticing the Duke of *Buckingham* to take the Crowne, which ruin'd him, opened the vaines of the poore subjects to bleede afresh. *Richard 3.*

The intollerable pride, extortion, bribery, luxurie of *Wolsey* Archbishop of *York* who can bee ignorant of? selling dispensations by his power Legantine for all offences, insulting over the Dukes and Peeres, of whom some hee brought to destruction by bloodie policie, playing with State affaires according to his humour, or benefit: causing *Turnay* got with the blood of many a good Souldier, to be rendred at the French Kings secret request to him, not without bribes; with whom one while siding, another while with the Emperour, hee sold the honour and peace of *England* at what rates hee pleased; and other crimes to bee scene in the Articles against him, *Hol. 912.* and against all the Bishops in generall. 911. which when the Parliament sought to remedie, being molt excessive extortion in the Ecclesiasticall Courts, the Bishops cry out; sacriledge, the Church goes to ruine, as it did in *Bohem*, with the Schisme of the *Hussites*, *Ibid.* After this, though the Bishops ceased to bee Papists; for they preached against the Popes Supremacie, *Henry 8. Hol. 845. 462. Speed 784.*

Hol. 992.

Speed 792.

Speed.

Statut. Hen. 792.

8. Anno.

25. cap 5.

Edward 6.

macie, to please the King, yet they ceased not to oppugne the Gospel, causing *Tindals* translation to be burnt, yet they agreed to the suppressing of Monasteries, leaving their revenewes to the King, to make way for the fix bloodie Articles, which proceedings with all crueltie of inquisition are set downe *Holinsh.* pag. 946. till they were repealed the second of *Edward* the sixth, stopping in the meane while the cause of reformation well begunne by the Lord *Cromwell*. And this mischief was wrought by *Steven Gardiner*, Bishop of *Winchester*. The fixe Articles are set downe in *Speed*, pag.

The Archbishop of Saint *Andrewes*, his hindring of *Englands* and *Scotlands* Union, for feare of reformation, *Speed* 794.

As for the dayes of King *Edward* the sixth, we cannot but acknowledge to the glorie of the rich mercie of God, that there was a great reformation of Religion made even to admiration. And yet notwithstanding we doe much dislike the humour of those, that crie up those dayes as a compleat patterne of reformation, and that endeavour to reduce our Religion to the first times of King *Edward*, which wee conceive were comparatively very imperfect, there being foure impediments which did much hinder that blessed work.

1 The three rebellions. One in *Henry* the eighth time, by the Priests of *Lincolne* and *Torkeeshire*, for that reformation which *Cromwell* had made. The other two in King *Edwards* dayes. One in *Cornewall*, the other in *Torkeeshire*.

2 The strife that arose suddenly amongst the Peeres emulating one anothers honour. *Speed* pag 837.

3 The violent opposition of the Popish Bishops, which made *Martin Bucer* write to King *Edward* in his booke *de Regno Christi. Lib. 2. cap. 1.* and say, your Majestie doth see, that this restoring againe the Kingdome of Christ,

Christ, which wee require, yea, which the salvation of us all requireth, may in no wise bee expected to come from the Bishops, seeing there be so few among them which doe understand the power and proper Offices of this Kingdome; and very many of them by all meanes (which possibly they can and dare) either oppose themselves against it, or deferre and hinder it.

The deficiency of zeale and courage even in those Bishops who afterwards proved Martyrs, witness the sharp contention of *Ridley* against *Haoper*, for the ceremonies. And the importunate suit of *Cranmer* and *Ridley* for toleration of the Masse for the Kings sister, which was rejected by the Kings, not only reasons, but teares; whereby the young King shewed more zeale then his best Bishops. 839.

The inhumane butcheries, blood-sheddings, and cruelties of *Gardiner*, *Bonner*, and the rest of the Bishops in *Queene Maries* dayes, are so fresh in every mans memory, as that we conceive it a thing altogether unnecessary to make mention of them. Onely wee feare least the guilt of the blood then shed, should yet remaine to be required at the hands of this Nation, because it hath not publikely endeavoured to appease the wrath of God by a generall and solemne humiliation for it.

What the practises of the Prelats have beene ever since, from the beginning of *Queene Elizabeth* to this present day, would fill a volume (like *Ezekiels* roule) with lamentation, mourning, and woe to record. For it hath beene their great designe to hinder all further reformation; to bring in doctrines of Popery, Arminianisme, and Libertinisme, to maintaine, propagate and much encrease the burden of humane ceremonies: to keepe out, and beate downe the Preaching of the Word, to silence the faithfull Preachers of it, to oppose and persecute the most zealous professors, and to turne

all Religion into a pompous out-side. And to tread
downe the power of godlinesse. Inasmuch as it is come
to an ordinary Proverb, that when any thing is spoyled
wee use to say, *The Bishops foot hath bene in it.* And
in all this (and much more which might be said) ful-
filling Bishop Bonners Prophecie, who when hee saw
that in King Edwards reformation, there was a refer-
vation of ceremonies and Hierarchy, is credibly re-
ported to have used these words; *Since they*
have begun to tast of our Broath, it will
not be long ere they will eat of
our Beefe.

The humane butcheries, blood-sheddings, and
crucifixes of Cardines, Bishops, and the rest of the Bi-
shops in Queens Marys dayes, are to flesh in every
mans memory, as that we conceive it a thing altogether
unnecessary to make mention of them. Only we
leave last the guilt of the blood then shed, should
yet remaine to be requited at the hands of this Nation,
because it hath not properly answered to requite
the wrath of God by a general and solemn manner on
that point.

What the praises of the Poets have done ever
since, from the beginning of Queens Elizabeth to this
present day, would fill a volume (like Hesiods song)
with a number of things to record. For
it hath bene their business to under all further
reformation; to bring in doctrine of Popery, Anti-
christianisme, and Licentiousness; to maintain, propagate
and much encrease the burden of humane ceremonies;
to keepe out, and heave downe the preaching of the
Word, to silence the faithful Preachers of it, to open
the eyes of the most ignorant, and to make

700. e. 17.
5

A
DEFENCE
OF THE

Humble Remonstrance,
Against the frivolous and false exceptions of
SMECTYMNVVS.

WHEREIN
The right of *Leiturgie* and *Episcopacie*
is clearly vindicated from the vaine cavils,
and challenges of the ANSWERERS.

By the Author of the said *Humble Remonstrance*. *Bishop Hale*

Seconded (in way of appendance) with the judgement
of the famous *Divine of the Palatinate*,

D. ABRAHAMVS SCVLTVS,

Late Professor of DIVINITIE in the
UNIVERSITIE of HEIDELBERG:

Concerning the Divine Right of EPISCOPACIE,
and the No-right of LAY-ELDERSHIP.

Faithfully Translated out of his Latine.

L O N D O N,
Printed for NATHANIEL BUTTER in Pauls
Church-yard at the pyde-Bull neare
St. Austins gate. 1641.